DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 790 EC 212 590

AUTHOR	Miner, David; And Others
TITLE	Educare: Evaluation of a Transition Program for Culturally Disadvantaged and Educationally Handicapped Youth. Final Performance Report, 9/1/85 to 10/31/87.
INSTITUTION	Institutional Development and Economic Affairs Service, Inc. Nederland, CO.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	88
GRANT	G008530282
NOTE	138p.; For executive summary, see EC 212 591.
AVAILABLE FROM	Institutional Development and Economic Affairs Service, Inc., Magnolia Star Route, Nederland, CO 80466 ($7.50).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Basic Skills; Bilingual Students; Computer Uses in Education; *Cultural Differences; *Daily Living Skills; Disabilities; Dropouts; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Ethnic Groups; Experiential Learning; Individual Development; Intervention; Limited English Speaking; Mentors; *Migrant Youth; Minority Groups; Outcomes of Education; Student Development; *Transitional Programs; *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

The Transition Instructional Program was designed to provide transition services to a culturally insulated group of dropout, migrant, bilingual youth of ethnic minority origin, a significant number of whom were adjudicated, handicapped, or limited English speaking. The project utilized experiential instructional techniques to promote the subjects' integration into "mainstream" culture by enhancing educational, personal, social, and economic measures of health. The students received training in General Education Development (GED) preparation along with training in four other program components: Foxfire, Rural Employability Development for Youth, Computer Practicum, and Peer-Mentorship.) Subjects were administered outcome measures of personal health (self-esteem, emotional integration, interpersonal competence, identity, and independence), measures of social health (social integration, sharing of norms with the larger social order, and personal competence), and measures of socioeconomic health (occupation or employment preparation and job relevant skills). Compared to controls who received GED preparation only, subjects showed improvement on all measures. Appendices, which make up approximately half the report, contain descriptions of the program components, descriptions of the scales used, a sample of the survey instrument, and various tables. (Author/JDD)

ED305790

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

GOO8530282

9-1-85 to 10-31-87

EDUCARE:

EVALUATION OF A TRANSITION PROGRAM FOR CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED AND EDUCATIONALLY HANDICAPPED YOUTH

Miner, David; Brennan, Tim; and Anderson, Frank

Institutional Development and Economic Affairs Service, Inc.

Nederland, Colorado 80466

EC 212590

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Abstract 1

II. The Research Problem 2

III. Subjects and Setting 4

IV. Methodology 10

V. Findings 20

VI. Conclusions 40

VII. Dissemination 55

I. ABSTRACT

This quasi-experimental descriptive study focuses on the evaluation of a four component treatment model designed to "transition" a culturally insulated group of dropout, migrant, bilingual youth, of ethnic minority origin (Russian, Hispanic, and American Indian), a significant number of whom were adjudicated, handicapped, and limited English speaking, into the "mainstream" culture by enhancing educational, personal, social, and economic measures of subject "health."

The Transition Instructional Program is made up of a four component educational treatment model, utilizing experiential instructional techniques, and is designed to enhance basic GED preparation for migrant dropout youth.

When subjects were compared on outcome measures of personal health, including self-esteem, emotional integration, interpersonal competence, identity, and independence; measures of social health, to include social integration, sharing of norms with the larger social order, and personal competence; measures of socio-economic health, to include type of occupation or preparation for employment after graduation, and job relevant skills; the Transition Instructional components [Foxfire, Rural Employability Development for Youth (REDY), Computer Practicum, and Peer-Mentorship] are found to be significantly effective on most outcome measures, over and above standard GED preparation for all subjects, including handicapped, adjudicated, and limited English speaking.

II. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

The central research problem in evaluating the Marion County High School Equivalency Program can be stated as: "How may a program best be evaluated which serves as a tool for economic, social, personal, and cultural change, especially change in the degree to which it transitions clients from one form or context to another?"

The model of transition utilized for this study is that of Halpern (1985), who viewed the transition concept primarily as a personal, social, and economic change process through which a handicapped individual might be assimilated into the mainstream of the general culture. This concept of transition is applied in the case of the Migrant Dropout Transition study to regard change not only as a personal, economic, and social process, but also as a cultural process, whereby culturally isolated groups of people might be more readily assimilated into the more general or dominant culture.

This transition process is accomplished through education--in the traditional sense of basic skills training in reading, written expression, mathematics, science, social studies, and other content curricula, but also as the kind of education which might enhance self-esteem and an individual's sense of personal worth, his/her sense of community and belonging in a social context, and his/her ability to not only survive economically, but to be able to achieve a standard of living commensurate with the standard of the community at large.

It was apparent then that, under ideal circumstances, an evaluation of the true effect of the program would require a future examination to determine if such effects would be manifest over the longer term. Unfortunately, the limited period of time under the grant period precluded this kind of examination of the problem. From the outset, we were required to examine the program from the perspective of its short-term effects on the subjects. To that end, we attempted to examine the short-range effects of the program on subjects' feelings of self-worth and personal identity; subjects' relationship to the more general, mainstream social order; subjects' achievement of economic security in the form of employment and the type of employment engaged in; as well as subjects' general competency in basic skills areas, including traditional content areas.

This study cannot be viewed solely from the perspective of scientific discipline, literature, or methodology, because it crosses boundaries and draws from diverse scientific perspectives. The study utilizes features of distinct scientific disciplines, as diverse as sociology, social psychology, delinquency, criminology, education, special education, psychology, and cultural anthropology. While the Migrant Dropout Transition project has examined the effect of an educational program on a group of migrant dropouts, it is the meaning and reality of the program's results for the student participants in the process of adapting to the broader society that is of greatest significance.

III. SUBJECTS AND SETTING

Research Setting

The research was carried out at a High School Equivalency Program (HEP) site in west-central Oregon. Located in the heart of the Willamette Valley, the state's principal agricultural area, the HEP School attracts dropout, farmworker youth who are ready to leave the fields, and seek increased job opportunities, continued education, or enrollment in vocational apprenticeship programs. This program serves principally farmworker youth from Yamhill, Polk, Clackamas, and Marion Counties, with recruitment being accomplished through extensive "grass-roots" contact and the support of a variety of state, county, and community service agencies. Such agencies in Marion County alone serve nearly half of the state's migrant and seasonal farmworker population (primarily Hispanic, but comprised also of Russian, American Indian, Anglo, and Black ethnic/racial groups).

While Hispanics make up the state's largest minority group, and nearly three-fourths of those reside in the HEP School's service area, the program's enrollment has, since 1984, reflected a nearly even balance between Hispanics and Russian students. During the period in which this research was undertaken (1985-1987), the research population was 35 percent migrant and 65 percent seasonal farmworker. It is worthy of note that most of these seasonal farmworkers were migrants in 1984, but were in the process of "settling out" during the research period. Oregon's economic diversification (conversion of agricultural

land to other purposes), coupled with changing patterns of farmworker migration from Texas and California, has resulted in many farmer migrants seeking local residential status.

The High School Equivalency Program: A Special Population

While the HEP program's student enrollment during the period of the research effort was approximately evenly divided between Hispanics and Russians, the latter group represented a unique culture, for they were children of Old Orthodox Russian farmworkers.

Known in the Mid-Willamette Valley as the Old Believers, they represent a culture rich in religious and folk tradition, whose expression takes form in chants and folksongs, in the calligraphy of ancient liturgical books, in handiwork--the richly embroidered curtains of ikon corners, prayer mats, woven belts, and colorful dress--in food, and in language. Church services are conducted in Church Slavonic, the language of religious texts that the children must learn. These elements of an old Russian way of life are now better preserved in Oregon than in many parts of the USSR. The Old Believer community living in and around Woodburn, Oregon, consists of three separate groups. Their informal names refer to previous places of settlement. Two groups moved to China from Siberia after the 1917 Revolution. The Sintzyantsi lived in the Sinkiang province after leaving Semipalatinsk; the Harbinsti settled around Harbin, Manchuria, China, having crossed the border from the Spassk-Dalnyi area.

Living in isolated rural villages, the people farmed and hunted. When, however, the Communists came to power in China in 1949, both groups were forced to emigrate again. The two groups met for the first time in the early 1950's in Hong Kong, where various charitable organizations aided in their resettlement. Most families moved to Brazil and Argentina, with major settlement on land provided for them at Curitiba, 200 miles from Sao Paulo. Poor soil and near famine conditions compelled them to move to Oregon in the 1960's.

A third group, the Turchani or Turkish group, originated in Southern Russia in the 17th century and, after various migrations, settled in Turkey in the 18th century. In 1963 the Tolstoy Foundation responded to their appeal for help and, aided by then Attorney General Robert Kennedy, arranged for their resettlement in New Jersey. Some of this group came to Oregon in 1967 to join the others. In 1981, an estimated 5,000 lived in Oregon, with largest concentrations in Woodburn, Mt. Angel, and Gervais.

The Old Believers preserve a religious calendar that holds deep significance for them in ordering their lives and in providing yearly traditional activities. It is the Julian calendar, now 13 days behind the Gregorian calendar, which is in general use. Several holidays forbid work or school attendance. Easter is the most important, and lasts a week. There are also 19 other major holy days which honor Christ, His Mother, and the Saints. Fasting is also an important observance. The religious

calendar also determines the naming of children, since each day commemorates the deeds of several Saints. According to the Baptismal ritual, each child is given a shirt, belt, and cross. These items have a significance that can be traced to Scripture and other religious writings that guide every aspect of daily living. For the rest of his or her life, an Old Believer is always to wear a shirt, belt, and cross.

In Oregon many Old Believers continue to lead an agricultural way of life. It is common for them to own farms and to help harvest crops, especially berries, in the summer. Since their arrival, however, a trend has been to take up modern, urban occupations also. Many work in the furniture factories, and sewing is a common occupation for women. Like other Oregonians, some work in the timber industry, mostly as tree thinners and planters. Because they have an effect on the communities where they live, adaptations have been made by native Oregonians as well. Instructions in driving and court procedures are in Russian, as are directional signs in local businesses and banks. Many school districts recognize the religious holy days, and there are bilingual programs.

The HEP Program and Its Students

During the research period (September 1, 1985, through October 31, 1987) the HEP program served 160 students, all of whom had discontinued their schooling at least six months prior

to enrolling in the program. One hundred fourteen subjects participated in the study.

Given the low levels of prior academic performance, inadequate basic skills preparedness, cultural deprivation, and socio-economic debility of its enrollees, the HEP program is organized and operated essentially as an open entry-open exit school. At intake, each student's academic preparedness is assessed, staffing is undertaken leading to the development of I.E.P.'s and individual learning units, weekly study and performance contracts are negotiated, and instructors and tutors are assigned. Periodic staff assessments are conducted and I.E.P.'s modified during the student's enrollment. Instruction is individualized, with staff and tutors coaching the student to achieve mastery in reading, writing, science, mathematics, and social studies. General Education Development (GED) Tests are administered by a nearby Oregon testing center when staff, tutors, and the student determine that the student is ready.

Transition studies are undertaken to enhance and make more meaningful the academic instruction and to prepare the student to function adequately in obtaining employment, pursuing further job training, or entering a higher education program. Life skill training is directed toward the affective areas: self-confidence, self-concept, and interpersonal relations.

The HEP students participating in the study are among the least represented in American society. All were school dropouts. Thirty-six percent were male, and 64 percent were female. The

mean age of the subjects was 19 years, 11 months. Twenty-nine percent were married. Thirty percent had one or more children. Over 61 percent were of Russian ancestry, 29 percent were Hispanic, 6 percent were Native Americans, and nearly 4 percent were non-Russian Caucasian. Twenty percent were limited English speaking.

The mean grade at which the subjects had dropped out of school was grade eight, the range being from grade two to grade twelve. The most prevalent reason for leaving school was the family's need for income. Nearly 30 percent had been retained in school. Twenty-six percent were handicapped. Almost all of the subjects or subjects' families received some form of public assistance.

Research Subjects

Subjects in the transition study were students or potential (enrolled but not served or minimally served) students at the HEP School. As a group, they met the federal definition of "migrant" for the purpose of the provision of services under grants for High School Equivalency (HEP) programs. All, therefore, were either seasonal or migrant laborers upon entering the program.

IV. METHODOLOGY

Basic Experimental Design

The basic experimental design of the study can be viewed as consisting of treatments by student cells: two treatment cells and a control cell, intersecting with special or regular education classifications. The schematic (below) indicates the factorial structure of this design. Sample sizes and cell sizes are given later in this document in Table 1.

	REGULAR STUDENT	HANDICAPPED STUDENT
MINIMAL OR NO INSTRUCTION (under 100 hours)		
GED INSTRUCTION (100 hours or over, no transition)		
GED PLUS TRANSITION INSTRUCTION (over 100 hours GED + transition)		

Subjects for the study were identified from HEP School records dating back no more than two years through the present, including currently enrolled students.

The control group consisted of potential students at the Marion County HEP School in Woodburn, Oregon, who, in fact, received minimal (defined as under 100 hours) or no GED or Pre-GED instructional services over, at most, the last two years of program operation and up to the present. In some cases these

students enrolled in the program and received minimal services, or in some cases they enrolled in the program but left before receiving services.

The first treatment group consisted of students who, within the same period of time as those receiving minimal or no services, undertook studies in preparation for GED exams in five areas: reading, mathematics, written language, social studies, and science. In some cases instruction was provided under guidelines for GED program instruction, and in some cases for Pre-GED instruction leading up to GED instruction. The subjects in these cells received varying amounts of GED or Pre-GED instruction, but all received over 100 hours. The one exception to this case occurred when a student had slightly under 100 hours of GED instruction but also had a significant amount of transition component instruction. In that event, the hours of GED instruction and transition instruction were added and, if the sum of the two equaled 150 hours or more, the subject was considered, at a minimum, to have received significant services (at least GED services level) and thus entered this treatment group.

The other treatment group consisted of students receiving instruction in the GED program and, in addition, some of the four component educational treatment:

1) Foxfire--an experiential learning model utilizing interviewing, photographic, and writing skills;

2) a computer practicum--a "hands-on" computer related instructional program;

3) a didactic, vocationally related instructional program; and,

4) a peer mentorship--pairing a student participant with a past participant in planning for the student's needs.

To qualify for inclusion in these cells, a subject had to receive a minimum of 100 hours of GED or Pre-GED instruction plus any significant amount of instruction in any of the (separate or combined) transition component areas. A "significant" amount of instruction was defined as at least 200 hours of combined GED and transition component instruction. Then, in the case where there was slightly less than 100 hours of GED instruction but many hours of transition component instruction, the subject was considered to be part of the transition group. (Please see Appendix A for a complete discussion of the treatment model.)

Each subject's participation in each component of the treatment was evaluated by hours of participation in that component and, therefore, by total participation in the treatment. This included both the GED cells and the "transition" cells. For example, data were accumulated by hours of GED instruction, hours of Foxfire, hours of Computer Practicum, etc. This assessment of the treatment hours provided a particularly sensitive measure of treatment exposure by component, by combinations of component, or by total relative participation in the treatment. It also allowed for specific predictions from each program component to particular scales within the dependent measure. In some cases, for example, predictions were made from

a particular transition component to a dependent scale; in others, from the sum of transition components to a dependent scale; and, in others, from the entire treatment to a dependent scale.

For ethical reasons, assignment of subjects to different treatment cells or to control group cells was determined by the subjects themselves, in that random experimenter assignment to a treatment group or to a control group would deny the benefit of treatment to those assigned to the control group, or would deny the benefit of transition treatment to those only receiving GED instruction.

The GED (Pre-GED or GED) group--tending to be an older sample of students, oftentimes having children, and in most cases employment--received services most often at night, while the transition treatment group--tending to be a younger sample of the population, often without dependents and without employment--generally attended school during the day as a matter of personal and group necessity. The control group, on the other hand, had as their only uniting characteristic the fact that they received under 100 hours of instruction in total. They, as a group, were obtained from existing records.

Since the day treatment group, by its nature, had more available time for instruction, they constituted the group receiving the most services (GED + transition) in the design, while the night group, due to its nature, constituted a naturally appropriate pool of subjects for the other treatment group.

Since the effect of age, the presence of dependents, employment status, etc., of the night group might characterize that group as more mature, higher achieving, etc., the statistical analysis required the use of the covariate "social maturity." Without the use of this covariate to mollify the potential effect of the systematic differences in "social maturity" within this population, the true relative effects of GED versus transition treatment might be misproportionately assessed. For this reason, analyses were performed both with and without the use of the covariate.

The differentiation between "special" and "regular" segments of the sample population within the design was made either by one of two methods. When available, past school (either from public schools or from the HEP School) records which indicated the presence of a handicapping condition were accessed to make the determination. When records were not available, the decision was made by evaluating subjects according to state and federal technical and procedural guidelines concerning educationally-related handicapping conditions.

Of special concern in determining the possible presence of handicapping conditions within a sample population of this nature was the possibility of bias due to the cultural or linguistic restrictiveness of the instruments and procedures normally used to make this determination. Federal and state mandates assert that the presence of a handicap must exclude the effect of cultural, economic, or educational disadvantage.

Thus, in most cases (approximately 75 percent of the cases included in the handicapped group cells), the customary use of instruments and procedures to determine special education eligibility was modified (see Appendix B for a full treatment of instrumentation and procedures used in the special education eligibility determination).

In all cases, an attempt was made to meet the full intent and scope of Education of the Handicapped Act and Oregon regulations by adhering to such procedural and technical guidelines as the utilization of multi-disciplinary teams as educational decision-making bodies, the provision for "consents to test" in the case of referred students, provisions designed to meet the needs of requirements for record confidentiality and access. In effect, for the purpose of establishing handicapped and "regular" groups, great attention was given to addressing all relevant legal, technical, and cultural/linguistic needs of the assessment process.

As well as collecting information on special education eligibility, measures of program participation (in hours) and demographic information (age, sex, marital status, etc.) were also collected on each subject (see Appendix C for a complete treatment of demographic variables).

Finally, the major instrument utilized in the study (see Appendix D for a copy of the instrument, as well as a description of its content) was administered to each subject, in most cases on a post-only basis, but in a percentage of cases, on a pre-post

basis (on entering the program, before services had been provided, and then after having received significant services or after having completed the program). Thus, for a percentage of subjects, a post-only measure of treatment effect exists, as well as a pre-post measure.

In the event that the instrument was used as a pre-test, subjects were instructed to consider items relating to school experience as applicable to their previous public school experience, instead of (as in the case of a post-test) their HEP School experience, so as to differentiate between the two school experiences, pre-post.

In the case where students were considered to be Limited English Proficient, translations were provided during interviewing by bilingual HEP School staff.

In most cases, initial subject equivalence on instrument related variables can reasonably be inferred from established subject equivalence on demographic variables (age, sex, ethnic group, etc.), as well as from other known features of the population (regional location, known history of the group, etc.)

Covariate

The covariate was made up of the following demographic variables: age, marital status, number of children, and a history of working while in school. Covariates were selected on the basis that they reflected the presence of a "social/community maturity" construct in this population. After an initial analysis, it was determined that the variables "marital status"

and "number of children" together had a better reliability (Alpha = .5685) than all four variables together, so that in some analyses all four variables were used as a covariate, and in other analyses only two.

Instrument

The major instrument utilized in the study was made up of a number of scales, most of which have known scale characteristics (reliability). Many scales served as dependent measures in the design. Some were more suitable for use as independent variables. In all cases, when a scale was used in the analysis, its reliability was computed. (See Appendix E for a description of scales and their reliabilieies.) A listing of potential dependent and independent scales imbedded in the instrument follows:

Independent	Dependent
Family Social Class	*What Is the Student Doing Now?
Parental Satisfaction with Instrumental School Activities	Pass GED tests?
Parental Involvement with Youth's Education	Pass GED?
Parental Emphasis on Education Continuation	Jobs Council (constructed) Instrument
Parental Involvement with School	GED Test Scores
Parent's Tolerance of Social Deviance	Youth Practical Independence
Youth Practical Independence from Parents	Safety In School (Prog. Eval.)
Youth Attachment to Parents	*Self-Esteem
Youth Involvement with Parents	*Practical Competence
Parental Supervision	*Interpersonal Competency
Parent-Child Conflict	*Learner Self-Concept
Parent Satisfaction	*Locus of Control
Parental Labeling	*Vocational Aspirations
Negative Peer Influence Regarding School	*Identity
Peer Attachment	*Social Isolation
Gangs in School	*Emotional Isolation
	*Normlessness

Social Isolation
Emotional Isolation
Social Isolation at School
Labeling by Peers
Peer Involvement
Normlessness
Self-Esteem
Practical Competence
Interpersonal Competency
Learner Self-Concept
Vocational Aspirations
Education Expectations
Boredom
Identity
Involvement with Jobs
Exposure to Drop-Out Behavior
Attitude Toward Drop-Out
Value for Independence
Rebellious Autonomy
Locus of Control (Attributions for Success/Failure)
Relevance of School
Importance of School Achievement
Enjoyment of School
School Effort
Attendance
Rebellious Behavior in School
School Rewards
Community Crime
Disruption of Education
Index of Invalidity
Rules/Teachers (Prog. Eval.)
Relevance of School (Prog. Eval.)
Enjoyment of School (Prog. Eval.)
School Punishments (Prog. Eval.)
School Rewards (Prog. Eval.)
Nonacademic Rewards (Prog. Eval.)
Importance of School Achievement
Gangs in School (Prog. Eval.)
Social Isolation at School (Prog. Eval.)
Individualized Instruction (Prog. Eval.)
Student-Teacher Relationship (Prog. Eval.)
Segregation (Prog. Eval.)
Differential Treatment (Prog. Eval.)
Influence at School (Prog. Eval.)
Racial Relations (Prog. Eval.)

*Major Dependent Variable
Prog. Eval.= Program Non-Evaluation Variable

Analysis was based on group comparisons, and predictive analysis. Treatment (in hours of participation) was an

independent variable. Some of the demographic information was also suitable for use as independent variables. For a complete treatment of the analysis, see FINDINGS section.

V. FINDINGS

Findings include: 1) descriptive statistics providing for a description of the sample at post-test, and the form and measure of the treatment applied; 2) multiple regression analysis for prediction from treatment measures to specific dependent scales on a post-only basis; 3) repeated measures MANOVA and MANCOVA analysis for group comparisons on specific dependent scales on a pre-post basis; 4) cross tabulation procedures for post-only group comparisons on important dependent measures; and, 5) discriminant analysis for comparisons of continuous scale independent (treatment) variables on important discrete dependent measures.

In all cases, we attempted to measure treatment success or lack of it, by way of its effect on various dependent scales.

Descriptive Statistics (The following percentages are calculated excluding missing values.)

One hundred fourteen subjects participated in the study on a post-only basis with 13 participating pre-post.

The subjects ranged in age from 16 years, 0 months, to 28 years, 8 months. As a group, they had a mean age of 19 years, 11 months. Forty-one subjects (or 36 percent) of the sample were male, and 73 (or 64 percent) of the sample were female.

Seventy-eight (or 68.4 percent) of the sample were single while enrolled in the HEP school; 33 (or 28.9 percent) were married; 2 (or 1.8 percent) were divorced; and, one subject (or .9 percent) was separated. Eighty subjects (or 70.2 percent) had no children; 19 subjects (or 16.7 percent) had one child; while 15

subjects (or 13.2 percent) had 2 children or more (the range being from 0-4). None of the subjects were veterans.

Seventy subjects (or 61.4 percent) were of Russian ancestry; 33 (or 28.9 percent) were of Hispanic ethnic origin; 7 subjects were American Indians; 4 (or 3.5 percent) were non-Russian Caucasian. Subjects' households consisted of from 1 to 12 individuals with the mean being 5.6. In many cases, subjects lived in nuclear or extended families, with 50 (or 48.5 percent) of the subjects reporting that their fathers lived with them; 65 (or 61.9 percent) reporting that their mothers did; 2 or (2.6 percent) having aunts or uncles living with them; 3 (or 2.64 percent) having grandparents live with them; and, 4 (or 5.2 percent) reporting that they lived with step parents. Thirty-six (or 32.1 percent) said that they had lived in their current dwelling for 1 year or less, while 76 (or 67.9 percent) had lived in their current dwelling for more than one year.

Twenty-two (or 19.3 percent) of the sample considered themselves to be limited English speaking, while 92 (or 80.7 percent) did not. Seventy-one (or 62.3 percent) of the subjects were bilingual.

Thirty-two (or 28.1 percent) reported that they had been convicted of a crime at some time, with 12 (or 10.5 percent) being on parole while in school.

Thirty-nine (or 39.8 percent) said that they had attended only one elementary school, while 75 (or 60.2 percent) had attended two or more, with 16 (or 16.3 percent) having attended more than four

elementary schools. In their middle school years, 51 subjects (or 68.9 percent) had attended only one school, while 23 (or 31.2 percent) had attended two or more, with only 4 (or 1.4 percent) attending 4 or more. The figures are nearly the same for high school, with 55 (or 75.3 percent) attending only one school, and 18 (or 24.7 percent) attending two or more, but only 4 (or 1.4 percent) attending four or more.

The mean grade at which subjects dropped out of school was the 8th, with the range being from grade 2 to grade 12. Forty-one (or 36 percent) of those sampled dropped out during the 8th grade. Sixty (or 52.6 percent) of the subjects stated that their reason for dropping out was that they needed money and went to work; 12 (or 10.5 percent) said that they were pressured by peers or family into quitting; 7 (or 6.1 percent) quit because they got married, with 4 (or 3.5 percent) being pregnant. Fifteen (or 13.2 percent) said they were behind in classes, with 3 (or 2.6 percent) expelled, and 5 (or 4.4 percent) saying that they just did not like school.

Twenty-six (or 29.5 percent) reported that they had been retained in public school. Forty (or 35.1 percent) were referred for evaluation for special education while in the HEP School. Thirty (or 26 percent) were found to be handicapped. (It should be noted that the comparison of referred to eligible is misleading in this case, since many of the eligible were not referred within the confines of the HEP School and were therefore not recorded as having been referred.) Of those found handicapped, 24 (or 21.1 percent) were found to be Learning Disabled; 2 (or 1.8

percent) were found to be Educable Mentally Retarded; and, 1 (or .9 percent) was found to be Seriously Emotionally Disturbed; also with 1 (or .9 percent) Speech/Language eligible, and 3 (or 2.6 percent) pregnant (under Oregon Administrative Rules, pregnancy is considered to be a handicapping condition for those under 21).

Only 3 (or 2.6 percent) of the sample said that they had previously participated in a GED program. Forty-five (or 47.9 percent) said that they had received some support from Social Security, with 34 (or 36.2 percent) saying that the support was in the form of disability benefits. Fifty-four (or 57.4 percent) reported that they had previously received food stamps. Eleven (or 11.7 percent) said that they had received public assistance. Fifteen (or 16 percent) had previously had Migrant Education services, and 6 (or 6.4 percent) had previous job training.

Forty-nine (or 43 percent) listed their plans after completing their GED were to go to work; 28 (or 24.6 percent) said that they intended to receive vocational training; 21 (or 21 percent) said that they intended to go to college; and, 11 (or 9.6 percent) had no plans after graduation. Forty (or 35.1 percent) were employed during the time they attended the HEP School.

The mean reading test score for a subject entering the program was 7-10 (G.E.). For math, 53 (or 49.5 percent) entered at the "Pre-GED" level; 31 (or 29 percent) at the "GED" level. These two levels imply adequate or less than adequate understanding of basic operations, i.e., addition, subtraction, multiplication, division. Seventeen (or 15.9 percent) had adequate "fractions level" skills;

4 (or 1.9 percent) understood percentages; 6 (or 2.8 percent) had an adequate knowledge of decimals; and, 5 (or .9 percent) understood algebra. Of entering writing test scores, 54 (or 50 percent) were at "Pre-GED levels," and 54 were at "GED levels."

The subjects received a mean of 174.95 hours of GED instructional services, with a range of from 12 hours to 675 hours of service. They received an average of 82.31 hours of "Transition" (for a description, see Appendix A) services overall with a range of from 0 hours of service to 397 hours of service. Individual transition component services were provided as follows:

	Mean	Range
Peer-Mentorship	13.82	0-72
Computer Practicum	18.31	0-90
REDY (Voc. Ed.)	20.75	0-95
Foxfire	29.43	0-140

Twenty-nine (or 25.4 percent) of the sample were considered to have received minimal instructional services of any kind; 26 (or 22.8 percent) were considered to have received significant GED (but not transition) services; and, 59 (or 51.8 percent) were considered to have had significant GED plus transition services.

Sample cells and cell sizes are listed in Table 1:

Table 1

	Minimal Instruction	GED	GED + Transition
Handicapped	5 (4.5%)	5 (4.5%)	21 (18.9%)
Not Handicapped	24 (21.6%)	19 (17.1%)	37 (33.3%)

Of the subjects who participated in the study, 64 (or 69 percent) (adjusted to exclude those not in school) completed the program and received their GED certificates, and 29 (or 31 percent) (again, adjusted) did not, with 21 subjects still in school at the end of the study.

Multiple Regressions

1. Emotional Isolation - The scale Emotional Isolation (Cronbach's Alpha = .82) measures individual attributes of a subject's lack of social integration. When the treatment variables as a group (i.e., the separate treatment components collapsed into the variable "Treatment") are regressed on this scale, the treatment as a whole (TREAT) has a significant negative relationship with the scale ($p<.02$). Thus, treatment shares significant variance with the scale such that highest treatment implies more social integration.

When the "Treatment" variable is broken down into "GED Treatment" (GED) and "Transition Treatment" (TRANS) and regressed on the Isolation scale, TRANS is found to share significant (negative) variance with the scale ($p<.006$) without the use of the

covariate, while GED fails to reach significance. When the covariate is again used in the analysis, TRANS is found to share less (negative) variance with the scale (R^2=.094, p<.07) but is again significant at the p = .10 level.

When this relationship is further broken down, and the treatment components (Foxfire, Peer-Mentorship, REDY, Computer Practicum), separately, are regressed on the Emotional Isolation scale, the component REDY (Voc.Ed.) is found to share significant (negative) variance with the scale (p<.01) without the use of the covariate. And, again, when REDY is regressed on the scale with the use of the covariate, it shares less (negative) variance with it (R^2=.088, p<.09). All of the treatment variables have negative relationships with the scale, implying that higher treatments are associated with higher levels of social integration.

2. Commitment to Conventional Norms - The scale Normlessness (from Gottfredson, 1983, Alpha = .66) measures a youth's attachments to conventional social norms. In this analysis, the scale direction reflects the presence of "normlessness." In the case where the TREAT variable is regressed on the Normlessness scale, the treatment as a whole shares a significant amount of (positive) variance with the scale (p>.03) without the use of the covariate. However, when the covariate is present in the equation, the effect is no longer significant.

When this relationship is more thoroughly analyzed, it is seen that the treatment component GED again shares significant variance with the Normlessness scale (p<.02) without the use of the

covariate, while no other components separately or together reach significant levels. With the use of the covariate, no significant sharing of variance occurs, even for GED. However, all of the treatment components have small positive relationships with normlessness, implying that more treatment is associated with lower attachment to conventional norms.

3. Practical Competence - The scale Practical Competence (Gottfredson, 1983; Nye, 1982, Alpha = .73) measures "survival skills" needed in the everyday world. When TREAT is regressed on this scale, it shares marginally significant (negative) variance with it ($p<.07$) without the covariate. With the use of the covariate, TREAT shows no reportable relationship to the scale.

When treatment variables, separately, are regressed on practical competence, the treatment component GED shares significant (negative) variance with the scale ($p<.02$) without the covariate. When the covariate is included, no significant sharing of variance occurs. No other treatment components, combined or separate, share a reportable relationship to the scale, with or without the use of the covariate.

4. Vocational Skill - The scale Jobs Council Scale (Alpha = .98) is an instrument developed out of a checklist used by the county based Jobs Council Program. It is used as a program evaluation tool and as a measure of treatment success. It has been adopted here to measure vocationally oriented aspects of the HEP program, most notably, REDY. When TRANS and GED are regressed on this scale, TRANS is found to share significant variance with it

($p<.03$), without the use of the covariate, while GED fails to reach significance. When the covariate is included, the significant relationship disappears, suggesting that prior group differences are responsible for the initial significant difference.

When the separate components are regressed on the scale, REDY is found to share significant variance with the scale without the covariate ($p<.02$), but not with it. It is to be noted that all of the treatment variables have a positive relationship with this scale, but none so much as the REDY component.

5. Social Isolation - The scale Social Isolation (from Jessor and Jessor, 1977, Alpha = .57) measures integration into a social network. For the purpose of this analysis, the scale direction reflects Social Isolation. When the treatment variables are regressed on this scale, GED is found to share significant (positive) variance with it ($p<.01$), without the use of the covariate. With the use of the covariate, the relationship loses its significant effects.

A further investigation of this relationship reveals that, when the separate treatment components are regressed on the Social Isolation scale, the component REDY shares significant (negative) variance with it ($p<.02$), while GED, without the effect of the variance of the other transition components, shares even more (positive) variance with the scale ($p<.003$) than before. This case is without the use of the covariate. With it, both components share slightly less variance with the scale (GED $p<.02$, a positive relationship; and REDY $p<.06$, a negative relationship).

6. Value for Independence - The scale Value for Independence (Jessor and Jessor, 1977, Alpha = .86) measures a youth's desires/values for autonomy and may serve as an indicator of adult "orientation." When TREAT is regressed on this scale with or without the use of the covariate, no reportable relationship is found. The case is the same for the dichotomous treatment measure of TRANS and GED. When they are regressed on the scale, no reportable relationship is found to exist with or without the use of the covariate. However, when the separate treatment variables are regressed on the scale, the program treatment component REDY is found to share a significant (positive) variance with Jessor and Jessor's scale ($p<.04$) when the covariate is not used. With the use of a covariate, less, although still marginally significant, variance is shared by the variables ($R^2=.10$, $p<.08$). The rest of the treatment variables, however, have no clear relationships with the scale.

7. Identity - Last, when the separate treatment components are regressed on the scale Identity (Alpha = .69), the component REDY is found to share near significant variance with it ($p<.07$) without the covariate, but not with it. All of the treatment variables have a positive relationship with this scale, but none significantly so.

(For a tabular treatment of the multiple regressions analyses, see Appendix F-1.)

PRE-POST ANALYSIS

Pre-post analysis uses repeated measures MANOVA and MANCOVA

procedures. Cells were designated as handicapped vs. non-handicapped by treatment groups. The analyses were based on specific scale comparisons pre-post, with and without the use of the covariate ("marital status," "number of children,"), on 13 cases. The length of time from pre-test to post-test varied with how recently the student had participated in the program. Pre-test to post-test duration ranged from two months to one year.

The scale Labeling by Teacher (Cronbach's Alpha = .66) assesses students' perceptions of how their teachers see them. When this scale is analyzed pre-post, students approach significant gains in their scores over time both without ($p<.09$), and with ($p<.09$) the use of the covariate.

The scale Self-Esteem (Alpha = .66) measures "personal" attributes of self-esteem. When it is examined pre-post on the sample, mean scores are found to significantly increase over time ($p<.05$), both with and without the covariate.

When examined pre-post, subjects' mean scores on the Normlessness (Alpha = .67) are seen to significantly decrease over time ($p<.02$), both with and without the covariate present. The scale Interpersonal Competency (Alpha = .63) correlates positively with measures of psychological health and adjustment, as well as reported school effort (Gottfredson, 1983). When this scale is examined on the sample pre-post, a significant gain in mean scores is found to occur over time ($p<.03$), both with and without the use of the covariate. Also, significant or near significant interaction effects are found pre-post on handicap ($p<.04$),

treatment group ($p<.07$), and handicap by group ($p<.06$), both with and without the use of the covariate. When this relationship is further analyzed, it is found that, within the group cells, there is a significant difference between the GED group and the "minimal instruction" group pre-test to post-test, in favor of the GED group ($p<.05$). There is also a marginally significant difference pre-test to post-test between the TRANS group and the minimal instruction group in favor of the TRANS group ($p<.08$). Further, the handicapped group, while showing no significant differences pre-post for the minimal instruction cell, shows significant gains pre-post in the GED+TRANS cell ($P<.0005$), but not for the GED cell. In the not-handicapped group, while there are no significant differences pre-post in the minimal instruction cell, there are significant gains for the GED cell ($p<.0005$), but significant losses within the GED+TRANS cell ($p<.005$). In partial explanation of this fact, we note the very high mean pre-test scores for the GED+TRANS group on the scale Interpersonal Competency. This was over four times as great as the highest value of any of the other treatment groups (Minimal Instruction, or GED). All of the preceding analysis had the same results with and without the use of the covariate.

When the scale Practical Competence (Alpha = .73) is examined pre-post, no significant differences in mean scores are found over time. There is, however a significant interaction effect within the group cells ($p<.007$) which, when further analyzed, reveals that there is a significant difference between the Minimal Instruction

cell and the GED cell ($p<.006$) with and without the use of the covariate.

When the Jobs Council Scale (Alpha = .98) is examined pre-post, there is a significant increase in mean scores for the sample over time ($p<.002$) without the use of the covariate. With the use of the covariate, this difference remains highly significant ($p<.005$).

Last, when the scale Value for Independence is examined pre-post, there is a significant difference in mean scores for the sample over time ($p<.000$), both with and without the use of the covariate.

(For a tabular treatment of the pre-post analyses, see Appendix F-2.)

Group Comparisons Analysis

Group comparisons analysis is based on Chi-square analysis for significance of group differences.

The outcome variable, "What is the student doing now?" (at post-test), consists of seven values: 1) Working in a migrant or seasonal capacity; 2) Working in permanent, non-migrant employment; 3) In a job training program; 4) In college; 5) Not Working; 6) In an apprenticeship program; and, 7) In the HEP School (for those who still had not graduated at post-test). Frequencies and adjusted (for missing values) percents for these values are listed in Table 2.

Table 2

Value	Frequency	Valid Percent
Working/Migrant	30	26.3
Working/Non-Migrant	36	31.6
Job Training	12	10.5
College	4	3.5
Not Working	8	7.0
Apprenticeship	3	2.6
In HEP School (at post-test)	21	18.4

Since all students who participated in the program and, therefore, the study, must be migrant workers (i.e., only those who meet the federal definition of "migrant" are eligible for participation), any employment mobility for the participants will necessarily be "upward" mobility, economically and socially (unless, of course the participants return to migrant work or are found to be unemployed at post-test). It was on this basis that this outcome variable was collapsed into a variable with only two values: 1) Bad outcome, consisting of a) Working in a migrant capacity, and b) Unemployed; and, 2) Good outcome, consisting of a) Working in a non-migrant capacity, b) In a job training program, c) In an apprenticeship program, and d) In college. The value, "In the HEP School," is excluded from the analysis, since the members of this group still, necessarily, have not completed the treatment.

When the outcome variable, in its dichotomous form, is examined against the case where a subject is handicapped, and the

case where she/he is not, no significant differences are found between handicapped and non-handicapped people, on outcome.

Also, when the outcome variable is examined against the case where a subject is limited English speaking and where he/she is not, no differences can be found between English speakers and non-English speakers on outcome. The case is the same for those who have been convicted of a crime and those who have not. Those who have been convicted of a crime are not more or less likely to have a good or bad outcome than those who haven't.

When the three treatment groups (Minimal or No Instruction, GED Instruction, GED and Transition Instruction) are compared to the dichotomous outcome variable, significant differences are found between groups on the outcome variable ($p<.0001$). When the same analysis is performed controlling for the variable "employed during school" (its use in this case is as the covariate "maturity"), a significant difference between groups is also found for those who were employed during school ($p<.001$), as well as for those who were not ($p<.01$). When the same analysis is performed controlling for the variable "marital status," significant differences between groups are found for married people ($p<.001$), and nearly so for those who were single ($p<.09$). When the analysis is again performed, this time controlling for the variable "having children," for those who did not have children, differences between groups were significant ($p<.0003$).

When the dichotomous dependent variable is examined on the basis of group differences controlling for the variable "presence

of a handicapping condition," significant differences are found between the three groups in the case where subjects are handicapped ($p<.03$), and in the case where they are not ($p<.005$).

When the three groups are divided into a control group, and a treatment group (No or Minimal instruction, vs. GED; and GED plus transition), and when these dichotomous groups are compared with the dichotomous outcome variable, the treatment group is found to be significantly more likely to have a good outcome, and the control group a bad outcome ($p<.03$). When this relationship is examined controlling for the variable "employed while in school," those who are employed during school do not have significant differences between groups on outcome; while those who are not have marginally significant differences ($p<.08$). When the two groups are compared to the outcome variables controlling for the presence or absence of a handicapping condition, no significant relationship is found between groups with or without the presence of a handicapping condition.

In the case where the dichotomous dependent variable is examined, controlling for those who did and who did not graduate from the HEP School (those with GED certificates and those without), a significant difference is found between groups, with the group who completed their GED's being more likely to have a good outcome than the group who did not ($p<.003$). When this relationship is examined controlling for the presence or absence of a handicapping condition, those who are handicapped do not show significant differences on outcome by groups, but those who are not

handicapped do, in favor of the treatment group ($p<.0002$).

When the three original groups are re-established, and the relationship between the three is examined in detail, the group most responsible for the effect on outcome can be identified. Specifically, when the control group is compared to the GED group on the dichotomous outcome variable, no significant differences are found on outcome between the control and the GED group. The case is the same when one controls for the occurrence of a subject's employment while in school. However, when the control group is compared to the transition group, the transition group is significantly more likely to have a good outcome than the control group ($p<.02$). Even when this relationship is examined controlling for the occurrence of a subject's employment while in school, the transition group is still more likely to have a good outcome ($p<.02$).

Further, when the transition group is compared with the GED group on outcome, the transition group is significantly more likely to have a good outcome than the GED group ($p<.001$). Even when one controls for the occurrence of a subject's employment during school, the transition group remains more likely to have a good outcome than the GED group ($p<.008$).

(For a tabular treatment of the group comparisons analysis, see Appendix F-3.)

Discriminant Analysis

Using discriminant analysis, it is possible to compare outcome groups across treatment variables (by components measured in

hours). Utilizing the three variable covariate (age, marital status, and number of children, Alpha = .32), when the treatment variables are "regressed" on the outcome variable, the following output occurs from the discriminant analysis:

Table 3

Variable	F-Ratio(1,114)	Significance of F
Foxfire	14.09	.0003
REDY	11.07	.002
Computer Practicum	9.05	.003
Peer-Mentorship	9.73	.002
GED	3.15	.08

All treatment variables contribute significant variance in a positive direction with a good outcome on the outcome variable, the four transition components significantly so, with Foxfire, by far, sharing the most variance with a good outcome, and GED barely reaching significance, even including the covariate "maturity" in this analysis.

A second discriminant analysis procedure was performed, utilizing the same variables as in the last equation, only controlling for the presence of a handicap. Results for this analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Discriminant Analysis Table/
Likelihood of Good Economic Outcome,
with and without Covariate, for
Handicapped vs. Non-Handicapped Cells
(empty cells have significance at p > .10)

	Handicapped	Non-Handicapped
FOXFIRE	F(1,21) = 14.72, p< .001	F(1,69) = 4.99, p< .03
REDY	F(1,21) = 5.49, p< .03	F(1,69) = 5.67, p< .02
Computer Practicum	F(1,21) = 8.51, p< .009	
Peer-Mentorship	F(1,21) = 7.17, p< .02	F(1,69) = 3.83, p<.06
GED	F(1,21) = 3.13, p< .09	

Finally, two more discriminant analysis procedures were performed utilizing the same variables, the first controlling for LEP and the second controlling for adjudication. Results are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 5

Discriminant Analysis Table/
Likelihood of Good Economic Outcome,
for LEP vs. Non-LEP Cells
(empty cells have significance at p > .10)

	LEP	Non-LEP
FOXFIRE		F(1,78) = 10.89, p< .002
REDY		F(1,78) = 8.30, p< .005
Computer Practicum		F(1,78) = 7.88, p< .007
Peer-Mentorship		F(1,78) = 7.72, p<.007
GED		

Table 6

Discriminant Analysis Table/
Likelihood of Good Economic Outcome,
for Adjudicated vs. Non-Adjudicated Cells
(empty cells have significance at p > .10)

	Adjudicated	Non-Adjudicated
FOXFIRE	F(1,27) = 4.65, p< .04	F(1,27) = 9.64, p< .003
REDY	F(1,27) = 10.18, p< .004	F(1,27) = 4.99, p< .03
Computer Practicum	F(1,27) = 6.62, p< .02	F(1,27) = 4.11, p< .05
Peer-Mentorship	F(1,27) = 6.10, p< .02	F(1,78) = 4.65, p<.04
GED		

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The Subjects

All of the subjects participating in the study were migrant, dropout youth of both sexes, with more females than males. The majority of subjects were single and, unlike most of the general population, most lived in extended families.

Almost all subjects were bilingual, and almost all were of ethnic minority, i.e., Russian and Hispanic.

Most of the subjects had lived in the local area for more than one year; however, a majority had apparently moved within the local area during the time they spent there, since most had attended more than one school. The fact that a majority of subjects had lived in the area for an extended period of time might be considered unusual for a migrant population, and may reflect the fact that the subjects were more likely to have been "seasonal," rather than true "migrant" farmworkers.

Most of the subjects had dropped out of school just before they were to enter high school. The most common reason why they dropped out was "to go to work." A significant number of them had been retained while they were in school (29.5 percent); many had a history of delinquency (28.1 percent); and, many were handicapped (26 percent). The presence of handicapping conditions within the sample was, therefore, close to 2.4 times as much as that normally found in the general population.

A significant number of subjects reported that they or their families had at one time received some sort of public assistance.

Most subjects successfully completed the program, with most indicating that they intended to go directly to work after graduation. Of those who intended to seek additional training after graduation, most indicated that they intended to undertake vocational training. Fewer of them stated that they intended to undertake advanced academic training.

Caution I: Atypicality of the Sample and Regression Towards the Mean

It should be noted that all of the sample under study were either dropouts, delinquents, had a history of academic problems, or experienced other difficulties while in school, while others were handicapped. Thus, it is likely that scores on various scales known to have strong relationships with these problems will naturally be reflected in the group means at pre-test. For example, one would normally expect a population of this nature to have high scores on measure of "emotional isolation," "normlessness," and "social isolation," and low scores on measures such as "practical competence," or scales measuring attitudes toward school and teachers. The treatment, then, in order to demonstrate an appreciable effect, must not only influence the scales, but must actually reverse the naturally occurring characteristics of this group.

A critical feature of atypical, or deviant, groups which have such low scores is regression toward the mean over time. This is particularly problematic in comparing atypical groups to "normal" groups; i.e., group differences would naturally diminish over time. In the present research, all of our sample are atypical and we do not have a "normal" group in the design. Thus, regression to the mean may be somewhat mitigated in pre-post comparisons to assess the trends in scores.

In some cases, when we examine changes in the scales, the treatment is powerful enough to reverse the naturally occurring (negative) characteristics of these youth. In the cases where the trends are not reversed, one can almost always see that the directional effect of the treatment is toward a lessening of the naturally occurring effects of being a dropout, or having a history of difficulty in school, or being delinquent, or educationally handicapped. The effect of the treatment may be to lessen, but not totally reverse, the naturally occurring trends in the data. Many of the trends in the data, which would normally be thought to be against the direction of the treatment, are, therefore, more reflective of the population under study than they are of the effect of the treatment. In fact, in almost all cases where there are naturally occurring negative trends in the data, the effect of the treatment is to lesson, if not to totally reverse, the natural (negative) trends in the data.

Caution 2: Non-Equivalence of Experimental Groups and The Effect of the Covariate "Maturity"

Of interest, also, in most of the post-only multiple regression analyses, is that when significant effects are found in any direction on a scale without the use of the covariate, they are likely to disappear, or at least to lessen, when the covariate is included in the analysis. It can be assumed, then, that not only may the covariate be a powerful measure of "maturity," but that the effect of prior differences in comparison groups is more powerful than the effect of the treatment. It may be, then, not that the treatment does not positively effect the more mature youth (older, working, married), but that they are more likely to have prior high (or low, as the case may be) scores on a particular scale, anyway.

This is usually dealt with in non-equivalent, quasi-experimental designs through covariates analysis. We have tried to deal with prior differences in subjects' scores on independent variables by using the covariates analysis approach. The results of these analyses indicate that, in may instances, the treatment effect is swamped by the introduction of covariates. In a few instances, however, differences and treatment effects remain after the introduction of covariates. Thus, we can make some reasonably justifiable claims regarding successful treatment effects.

Post-Only Analysis of Specific Scales

The scale Emotional Isolation may, at least in part, be considered to be a reverse component of personal, as well as

social, integration. Thus, it may be considered to be a negative component measure of Halpern's concept of social integration into the larger social context. This is one of the three major "pillars" of his model of effective transition. On this scale, on post-test, the effect of the treatment seems not only to lesson, but to reverse the naturally occurring trend for there to be high isolation in this sample. The treatment as a whole lowers scores on the scale and, thus, students who receive significant hours of program services are less likely to be "emotionally isolated." It turns out that this is true far more for those who receive transition instructional services than for those who receive GED instructional services. Furthermore, this influence is far more likely where a subject received significant services in the REDY component of the transition.

While this effect still holds up in the presence of the covariate "maturity," it is much less significant.

The case is not the same, however, for Normlessness, a scale which, again, could be considered to measure some aspects of Halpern's concept of social integration as a part of transition. The effect of treatment, in this case, is not powerful enough to eliminate what would be the naturally occurring tendency for there to be high normlessness in this sample. It is of note, however, that those who participated in GED are more likely to receive high scores on this scale than are those who participated in transition; i.e., the more transition services a subject receives, the less likely he/she is to receive high scores on this scale. Again, more

"mature" subjects are less likely to have high scores on the Normlessness scale at entry into this program.

The above results are replicated for the scale Practical Competence. That is, the effect of the treatment is not powerful enough to reverse the naturally occurring prior tendency for there to be low scores on this scale with this sample of subjects. Again, this fact is more likely to be true of subjects receiving GED services than transition services. Non-equivalence of the experimental groups is again underscored when significant differences in Practical Competence of post-test disappear with the introduction of the covariate to the regression equation.

The scale Social Isolation, again, may be considered to (negatively) reflect a subject's social integration in the Halpern model of transition. Again, with a population of this nature, one assumes that the "naturally" occurring tendency would be toward high isolation. A major finding is that the transition level of programming seems to mitigate the tendency towards isolation. This effect remains significant for both older and younger students.

The Jobs Council Scale was intended for use in both evaluating the REDY program and in measuring a student's job related level of skill development. Not only do those participating in REDY receive significantly higher scores on this scale but, more generally, those participating in the transition components (but, notably, not the GED component) rate themselves with significantly high scores on this scale with increasing hours of transition participation. Again, this is not the case when the subject is rated as more

"mature" (an effect is still present, but it is not significant).

Regarding Value for Independence, while no significant effects are found at the level of the treatment as a whole, or at the level of its dichotomous components, in the case of the component REDY, those participating were significantly more likely to have high scores on this scale. Those among the REDY group who were more "mature" were less likely to show this tendency toward higher scores as a result of the treatment. Thus, when the covariate "maturity" is introduced to equalize pre-test differences, the effect size is profoundly reduced. Finally, the same result appears for the scale Identity in that those participating in the REDY component were significantly more likely to exhibit high scores on this scale than those who did not participate. The Identity scale might be seen to reflect Halpern's notion of enhanced personal worth and understanding, one of the three components of his transition model. Subjects, as measured on this scale, tended to see themselves as relatively more personally integrated than those who participated in other components of the treatment. Again, this was less likely to be the case for the more "mature" among them; i.e., the result is weakened when the covariate is introduced.

Pre-Post Analysis of Specific Scales

The pre-post comparisons in this study suffered from a very small number of subjects. Thus, although statistically significant findings emerged from these comparisons, it remains prudent to treat these findings with caution. Students show a change towards

higher scores over time on Self-Esteem. This occurs both in the case of the more and less "mature" subject. This finding suggests that the treatment may be said to enhance a student's self-esteem over time. This effect is one of the prerequisites of Halpern's model of effective transition.

Additionally, students in these comparisons tend to score lower on Normlessness, over time, both in the case of the more and less "mature" subject. This suggests that while the post-only analysis of normlessness does not seem to be powerful enough to reveal a significant effect of the treatment on this scale, the pre-post analysis, on the contrary, reveals it clearly.

In the case of the scale Interpersonal Competency, students again tend to produce higher scores over time and as a result of the treatment, in cases of both more and less "mature" individuals. In addition, most of this effect over time is due to the GED and the transition portions of the program. Further analysis reveals that the effect occurs proportionately more for the handicapped subjects within the transition group than for the GED group and, in the contrary case of the group of non-handicapped subjects, the effect occurs proportionately more for those in the GED group and less for those in the transition group. In other words, it might be said that, in the case where the treatment is seen to enhance "interpersonal competency" over time, the effect is more likely to occur for a handicapped individual receiving transition services, and for a non-handicapped individual receiving GED services, with both the handicapped and non-handicapped subjects showing

significant increases in "interpersonal competency" over time.

In the case of the scale Practical Competence, subjects tend to significantly increase in scores on this scale over time, as an effect of the treatment, both in the case of a more and less "mature" subject. This, of course, is evidence of an effect on the dimension of a subject's "interpersonal competency," in a positive direction, revealed on pre-post analysis, which a post-only analysis had been unable to uncover. Again, "interpersonal competency" may be seen as relating to both the self-esteem and social/community integration aspects of Halpern's model of transition.

When the Jobs Council Scale is evaluated on a pre-post basis, the results indicate a confirmation of at least some of the effect found on a post-only basis, since one finds there to be a significant increase over time for scores on the scale in the case of a less "mature" individual and, interestingly, even more so in the case of a more "mature" subject. The treatment, then, seems to cause scores on this scale to increase over time for all subjects, but is even more likely to cause increases in the case where subjects are older, have children, or are married.

Group Comparisons Analysis of an Outcome Measure: Student Activity at Post-test--Good Outcome vs. Bad Outcome

The outcome variable "Good vs. Bad" measures what might be called a real or potential (in the case where a student at post-test is continuing his/her education) good vs. bad outcome of a socioeconomic nature. It functions as both a measure of social

"status" or stature and of economic security or even prosperity. Since it is not possible to evaluate the subjects several years from now on income levels or social standing in the community as the Halpern model would require, it was deemed next best to evaluate them on immediate or near immediate outcome after graduation on activity, as a measure of their socioeconomic success at post-test.

In the first case, group comparisons analysis reveals no significant effect on outcome good vs. bad for the presence or lack of a handicapping condition, a history of having committed a crime or the absence of such a history, or for the effect of being or not being limited English speaking. That is to say, these effects, separate from the effect of the treatment, have no significant relationship regarding whether or not a subject had a good or bad outcome at post-test.

The treatment, however, clearly has a significant effect on outcome, with subjects participating in the treatment group being significantly more likely to have a good outcome than subjects in the control group. Further, the transition group was found to be responsible for most of the effect, since it, and not the GED group, was significantly more likely to produce a good outcome than when subjects received minimal or no GED instruction. This remains true even in the event that the subject is older, married, or has children.

When this effect is examined with regard to presence of handicapping conditions, the program has the same significant

effect for both the handicapped and non-handicapped groups.

Further, a subject is even more likely to have a good socioeconomic outcome if he/she is a graduate of the program than if he/she is not. Most of this effect, however, occurs within the non-handicapped group, and is less likely to occur for a handicapped person who is also a graduate.

Discriminant Analysis

Finally, the one limitation of the group comparisons analysis procedure is that, in its present configuration, it does not allow for comparisons of relative effectiveness on socioeconomic outcome of the separate treatment components, apart from simple group differences. This limitation is overcome with the use of a discriminant analysis procedure, whereby the separate treatment components may be "regressed" on the outcome variable, with low values being indicative of a bad outcome, and high values, of a good outcome.

When this analysis is undertaken, all treatment components are seen to significantly contribute to a good socioeconomic outcome, except for the GED component, which nearly significantly contributes to a good outcome. The component which is seen to most contribute to a good socioeconomic outcome for subjects is the component Foxfire, followed by the REDY component, followed by the Computer Practicum component, followed by the Peer-Mentorship component. Thus, at least on this outcome variable, as opposed to others, the components which are most likely to produce a good outcome are rank ordered in importance above, with Foxfire leading

all components in contribution by far, and the REDY component being next in importance.

When the variance on economic outcome at post-test is partitioned by handicapped and non-handicapped subjects, the handicapped group is found, in general, to be significantly more likely to benefit by, primarily, the Transition components, than the non-handicapped group. While program services are significantly more likely to produce a good economic outcome for non-handicapped subjects as well, in most cases, services are even more likely to produce a good outcome for educationally handicapped subjects.

The same is not the case for LEP students, since non-LEP students are significantly likely to have a good economic outcome as a result of participation in Transition components, but LEP subjects are not.

Both adjudicated and non-adjudicated subjects, however, based on participation in the Transition components, are significantly likely to have a good economic outcome.

Summary Conclusions

Andrew Halpern's (1985) model of successful transition suggests that a measure of a program's effectiveness in this regard may be viewed as a three-pillared structure consisting of: 1) the enhancement of a subject's self-esteem and sense of personal worth (subject personal health, to include personal identity, personal emotional integration, a sense of personal competency, personal self-esteem); 2) the enhancement of a subject's social/community integration within the "larger" social context (subject social-

relational health, to include an enhanced sense of personal social integration, a sharing of social norms with the larger community or society, a sense of practical competence within a social context, the possession of skills related to the context of the world of work); and, 3) the enhancement of a subject's ability to earn a living and succeed economically within the larger social context (subject socioeconomic health, to include type of occupation or, if not employed, attempts of a subject to prepare him/herself for economic independence, i.e., education or training, and the presence of marketable job related skills). We are also postulating here that these same measures may ultimately be viewed as measures of cultural transition, in the case of those who may be, as a group, culturally isolated, since they measure not only important subject individual health variables, but variables central to the state of the health of the relationship between an individual and his/her larger culture.

While a thoroughly definitive evaluation of the research question in this case is not possible at this time, due to the necessarily short-term nature of the instant Migrant Dropout Transition study, results of this preliminary, limited analysis lead one to conclude that the Marion County HEP School program, to include the GED component of instruction, but especially the transition components, enhances subjects' self-esteem; subjects' sense of emotional "belongingness;" subjects' sense of personal competence; subjects' value for independence; subjects' sense of personal identity; subjects' sense of social integration and of

the sharing of norms with the larger community/society; subjects' sense of personal competence within a social context; subjects' work related skills; and, subjects' economic success, or potential for success; and, serves as a tool for successful personal, social, economic, and cultural transition for culturally isolated, dropout, migrant, at times delinquent, and at times handicapped, youth.

As to the question of the program's effectiveness for subjects with handicapping conditions, as well as other disadvantaging conditions, the evidence is clear. In general, the program is effective for both handicapped and non-handicapped, adjudicated and non-adjudicated, subjects. In addition, while the program is not as likely to be as effective for LEP as it is for non-LEP, it is more likely to be effective for handicapped than non-handicapped students.

While student/subjects do not view their school environment as a particularly safe one, they feel they have enhanced influence at school, receive rewards of a non-academic nature as well as of an academic nature, are liked by their teachers, and they have a strong sense of attachment to their school environment.

It is clear that the transition components have far more influence on creating a positive outcome than does the GED component. Beyond this conclusion, the portion of the analysis examined determines which of the transition components is the most effective. If one looks at the post-only analysis of the specific scales, the winner is clearly the REDY component. If one looks at the discriminant analysis of the socioeconomic outcome variable,

the verdict is Foxfire, followed by REDY, followed by the Computer Practicum component, followed by the Peer-Mentorship component.

For a thoroughly definitive answer to the question of HEP School program effectiveness in producing a personal, social, economic, and cultural transition into the "mainstream" for these dropout, migrant youth, further study is needed on personal, social, and economic, and, therefore, cultural outcome for these individuals, from a minimum of five to ten years in the future.

VII. DISSEMINATION

Non-Technical Research Summaries

The results of this study have been reduced to an executive summary format and distributed to a wide variety of organizations and individuals that would be interested in the findings of this effort but that are not primarily members of the research community. These organizations and individuals include state and federal policymakers, regional and local educational practitioners, and state and national educational organizations. Over seventy reports have been distributed.

ERIC

Two copies of this final report have been sent to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children.

The Complete Research Report

Special Education and Migrant Education research personnel, organizations, and agencies will be alerted to the completion of this study. Upon request, the grantee will provide copies of the complete report at the cost of production and mailing.

Journal Articles

Seven special education journals have, or soon will have, received articles formatted to their requirements. It is anticipated that the Journal of Special Education will publish in mid-1989. (For a partial list of organizations, individuals, and journals contacted, see Appendix G.)

LIST OF REFERENCES

Brennan, Tim; Huizinga, David; and Elliott, Delbert S. The Social Psychology of Runaways. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co., 1978

Dennis, P. T.; Coulter, D. K.; and Harms, N. High School Improvement Program: Report on Project 374 of ESEA Title 4-C. 1979

Eliot, Delbert; Huizinga, David; and Ageton, Suzanne S. Explaining Delinquency and Drug Use. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1985

Gottfredson, Gary; Gottfredson, Denise C.; and Cook, Michael. The School Action Effectiveness Study Report No. 342. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Center for School Improvement, 1983

Halpern, Andrew S. "Transition: A Look at the Foundations." Exceptional Children, Vol. 51, No. 6, pp. 479-486. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1985

Jessor, Richard and Jessor, Shirley L. Problem Behavior and Psychosocial Development. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1977

Nye, F. Ivan. Family Relationships. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1982

APPENDIX

A - Program Components--Treatment Description

B - Special Education

C - Demographic Variables

D - Instrument

E - List and Description of Scales

F-1 - Multiple Regression Table

F-2 - Difference-Scores Table

F-3 - Group Comparisons Table

G - Dissemination

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM COMPONENTS--TREATMENT DESCRIPTION

General/Definitional

The educational treatment and program components examined in this study included the components related to Pre-GED and GED instruction, those instructional components which prepared the student-subjects to pass the five GED examinations allowing them to obtain certification of High School Equivalence. The "transition" components, i.e., that portion of educational treatment which seeks to address the transitioning of the young student-subjects into the cultural mainstream were implemented following the successful completion of the GED student's fourth skill examination.

Theoretical Basis of Treatment

The theoretical basis of the instant model relates to its hypothesized potential to successfully "transition" those who had been insulated from active participation in the general culture into more thorough participation, resulting in the ultimate benefit of those served and that of the larger society. The model focuses on a number of overlapping disadvantaged and underserved populations: ethnic and racial minorities, religious or cultural minorities, linguistic minorities (including bilingual individuals), the economically disadvantaged, the educationally or culturally disadvantaged, the handicapped, single parent youth, and youth with a history of social deviance or criminal behavior.

Pre-Ged Component

The clients served in this category exhibited one or more of the following characteristics:

- o reading, mathematics, and grammar assessments at intake of below the fourth grade level;
- o severely limited (verbal) English language mastery; or,
- o significant and limiting personal conditions affecting program participation on a regular basis. Such factors include judicial probationary status, court-ordered community service obligations, behavioral disorders, family (dependent) responsibilities, and substantially lower income, among others.

The educational goal of the program was as follows:

To elevate basic skill competency (reading, mathematics, and grammar) and English language (verbal) proficiency of the migrant and seasonal farmworker students admitted into the program who did not possess achievement levels necessary for GED study and attainment (20 percent of the total HEP enrollees). Once such levels of achievement were satisfactorily raised, Pre-GED students were placed into GED and other HEP instructional components.

The objective of the program further was that a minimum of 60 percent of students classified as Pre-GED enrollees in the Marion County HEP would, by the completion of the grant period, have achieved minimum basic skills competencies necessary for GED study, in the following:

- o a minimum fourth grade reading and mathematics level; and,

- a minimum average score of 4.5 on the Wide Range Achievement Test.

Programmatic activities were as follows:

With a few exceptions, activities and instructional delivery methods were quite similar to those provided GED students. Classes were structured, but were highly individualized to meet enrollee needs. HEP personnel engaged in the following activities:

- performed initial assessments of participants' academic achievement levels in reading, mathematics, and English language skills (verbal and written);
- developed individualized learning units for each participant based upon initial assessments and an Individual Education Plan;
- negotiated weekly contracts between individual enrollees and staff facilitator providing study assignments geared toward completion of objectives cited in the IEP;
- engaged small group (2-3 students per instructor), individualized instruction and independent assignments based upon weekly contract;
- completed periodic progress assessments (monthly) to provide feedback to students and instructors regarding individual achievement underway and allow for supportive intervention and modification of IEP, as necessary; and,
- placed Pre-GED students in the GED instructional program at the time of basic skill mastery as evidenced by minimum scores on achievement assessments.

Programmatic timelines were as follows:

These were ongoing throughout the program duration. They included 20-35 hours of weekly instructional services provided each Pre-GED enrollee, based upon individual student need and circumstance.

Evaluation procedures were as follows:

The research staff conducted a pre/post assessment of basic skill achievement. The HEP Associate Director's staff maintained participant records citing the number of Pre-GED enrollees, pre-program assessments, and the number of subjects subsequently enrolled in the GED component, as well as copies of the Pre-GED students' IEP's.

GED Component

The programmatic goal was as follows:

To insure that HEP participants possess the academic skills necessary to obtain a high school diploma or its equivalent.

The programmatic objective was as follows:

By the completion of the grant period, at least 75 percent of the HEP/GED candidates were to have successfully passed the GED examination or obtained a high school diploma.

Programmatic activities were as follows:

HEP personnel engaged in the following activities in order to assist students in completion of the GED unit:

- conducted initial assessments of participants' academic levels in reading, science, mathematics, social studies, and language skills (writing);
- developed individual learning units for each participant based upon initial assessments and an Individual Education Plan citing objectives for that student;
- negotiated weekly contracts between individual enrollees and their staff facilitator providing work assignments leading to completion of objectives in enrollees' Individual Education Plan;

- small group tutorial sessions (4-5 students per instructor), individualized instruction, and independent assignments based upon the weekly contract were conducted by the student's facilitator;

- regular progress assessments (every two weeks) conducted by HEP staff provided feedback to both students and instructors regarding continuing individual achievement and allowed for supportive intervention and modification of the Individual Education Plan as necessary; and,

- GED examinations administered by Chemeketa Community College were undertaken by enrollees at any time during the program operation with facilitator approval.

Programmatic timelines were as follows:

Throughout the program cycle duration these included 20-25 hours weekly of GED instruction based upon individual student need.

Programmatic evaluation procedures were as follows:

The HEP Associate Director maintained participant records citing the number of GED examinations passed by HEP students and copies of the Individual Education Plans.

Transition Components

Foxfire

Basic Skills Unit
(Accomplished Through Foxfire Instructional Format)

The programmatic goal was as follows:

To develop basic skills competencies (reading, writing, oral communication, and computation) and competencies in study skills (reference, research, and organizational skills) through involvement in Foxfire-based learning activities.

The programmatic objective was as follows:

At the completion of the HEP grant, 80 percent of enrollees were to have attained mastery of the competency-based Foxfire curriculum.

Programmatic activities were as follows:

The Foxfire/GED instructors, assisted by the other HEP staff, engaged HEP participants ten hours weekly in Foxfire learning activities, including those related to community research and documentation (interviewing, writing, photography, darkroom techniques).

Programmatic timelines were as follows:

Throughout cycle duration there was a minimum of ten hours weekly for all Foxfire activities.

Programmatic evaluation procedures were as follows:

The "Student Competency Record" recorded competencies mastered by students. Student-authored articles appearing in Reflecting Image provided further evidence of student mastery of basic skills areas.

Life Skills Unit
(Accomplished Through Foxfire Instructional Format)

The programmatic goal was as follows:

To stimulate participant growth in affective and social relations areas.

The programmatic objective was as follows:

By the completion of their HEP cycle participation, HEP enrollees were to have evidenced improvement in such affective

areas as self-confidence, self-concept, and interpersonal relations.

Projected programmatic activities were as follows:

The GED/Foxfire instructors, assisted by other instructional staff, engaged HEP participants in a minimum of ten hours weekly of Foxfire learning activities--including those that required student involvement in situations demanding individual and group cooperation in order to complete assignments, while generating reinforcement provided by interviewing successfully employed ex-migrants who served as role models.

Programmatic timelines were as follows:

Throughout cycle duration a minimum of ten hours weekly were allocated for all Foxfire activities.

Programmatic evaluation procedures were as follows:

Responsive Evaluation format utilizing case studies, self-evaluation, and interviewing of students, families, and HEP staff reflected affective growth in HEP enrollees.

Career Readiness (REDY)

The programmatic goal was as follows:

To insure participant awareness of individual career interest areas and aptitudes, to provide participants with an understanding of the work-world beyond past experience, and to develop HEP participant skills leading to increased career opportunities.

The programmatic objective was as follows:

Results of assessments to determine individual career interests/aptitudes were provided to all HEP participants. Eighty percent of HEP enrollees were to have attained mastery of the career development unit of the competency-based Foxfire curriculum.

Programmatic activities were as follows:

Career development activities were an integral part of the HEP students' schedule and included:

- a World of Work unit presented through Chemeketa Community College;
- administration of General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB) by Chemeketa Community College;
- administration of California Occupational Preference System (COPSystem) Inventory by Chemeketa Community College;
- administration of other assessment instruments as determined by Chemeketa Community College counseling staff, e.g., the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory, Kuder Occupational Interest Survey, Chemeketa Placement Test Battery, etc.;
- orientation and use (including career selection, retrieval and data collection activities) of the Career Information System (CIS) at Chemeketa Community College by counseling staff;
- research undertaken at the College's Career Information Library (including such materials as "Interviews with Chemeketa Grads");
- participation in the Career Day Conference sponsored by the Oregon Human Development Corporation and the Migrant Education Service Center;
- site visitations to community businesses and presentations by employers; and,
- presentations by area service agencies including OHDC, the Oregon State Employment and Training Division, and Mid-Willamette Jobs Council.

Assisted by HEP instructional staff, students engaged in Foxfire learning activities necessary for the production and marketing of the student-authored Foxfire publication, Reflecting Image, including:

- career interviewing and job shadowing activities; and,
- documentation of results in the form of a Career Profile.

Toward the completion of participation in the HEP program, each enrollee participated in a Skills Refinement Seminar, which included instruction in completing job application forms, job seeking letters, resume writing, college admissions procedures, and financial aid applications, conducted by Chemeketa Community College and HEP staff.

The HEP Community Resource Coordinator/Counselor, supported by community resource personnel, assisted each participant to create his/her own Employability Development Plan, which included supportive background materials such as letters of reference and resumes.

Programmatic evaluation procedures were as follows:

Participant files maintained by the HEP Associate Director recorded assessment results. Copies of student career choices made, research activities undertaken, and the documentation of findings were maintained in enrollee files, as were the Employability Development Plans. The Student Competency Record listed career-related competencies mastered by students. The publication of the student-produced magazine, Reflecting Image, was further evidence of student mastery.

Computer Practicum

The goal of the program was as follows:

To familiarize students with basic uses of the computer to include recreational/entertainment usage, computer assisted instruction, basic programming, basic computer awareness training, and word processing.

The objective of the program was as follows:

Eighty percent of those enrolled in the program were to meet the specified competencies.

Specific programmatic activities were as follows:

- recreational/entertainment usage occurred during approximately 80 percent of the allotted day and involved all students;
- CAI usage occurred during approximately 50 percent of the allotted day and involved approximately 75 percent of students;
- basic computer awareness training occurred approximately 70 percent of the allotted day and involved approximately 80 percent of all students;
- computer programming training occurred approximately 50 percent of the allotted day and involved approximately 75 percent of all students; and,
- word processing training occurred approximately 40 percent of the allotted day and involved approximately 75 percent of all students. Foxfire related word processing activities were incorporated within this activity.

Evaluation procedures were as follows:

Participant files maintained by the HEP Associate Director recorded assessment results. Students were evaluated on the basis of computer component competencies.

Utilization of Microcomputers in Instructional Format

The use of computers in the HEP program transcended CAI. IDEAS' HEP implemented the use of microcomputers on a limited basis with an overall goal of integrating the appropriate utilization of this technology in the instructional services provided enrollees. It remained a principal objective throughout the two grant years to develop means by which computers had direct applicability to the GED, Foxfire, and career components, thereby enhancing student learning and developing critical thinking, problem-solving skills, and creativity.

Peer Mentorship Component

The goal of the program was as follows:

To provide tutoring and counseling services to current students, making use of past successful HEP students and other successful college students as a resource.

The objective of this component was as follows:

Eighty percent of students enrolled in any transition level component were to participate successfully in this component.

The activities of this component were:

- basic skills tutoring (GED component);
- Foxfire component tutoring and assistance;
- computer practicum component tutoring and assistance; and,
- counseling related to:
  a) successful student program participation;

b) job and career awareness and readiness; and,

c) personal, financial counseling.

Evaluation procedures were as follows:

Participant files maintained by the HEP Associate Director recorded assessment results. Students were evaluated on the basis of feedback from their tutors as well as self-evaluation.

APPENDIX B

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Both technically and procedurally, the process and instrumentation used in making the eligibility decision is summarized adequately within federal (P.L. 94-142) and Oregon state (O.A.R. 581-15-051) regulations and need not be repeated here. The descriptions which follow are offered because they contain more specific information than is supplied in the regulations (as in the case of specific instrumentation, for example), or where special procedural modifications have been made in order to meet special needs (using the performance scale only of the ability measure to estimate "true" ability in a culturally/ethnically different population). In most cases it can be assumed that procedures and instrumentation specified in federal and state regulations and in Oregon state Technical Assistance Papers have been followed as closely as has been possible.

Instruments for the Determination of Special Education Eligibility

The following constitutes a list of instruments recommended by the SEP Project Manager for use in determining Special Education eligibility within the Marion County HEP population.

The instruments are categorized according to intended use and a short description of each instrument is provided as well as a description of the instrument's relevant technical properties.

Ability

Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised:

As its reviewer notes, the WAIS (the forerunner of the WAIS-R) has been the supreme measure for the appraisal of adult intelligence for the last quarter-century.

It has excellent technical characteristics to include a very large normative sample consisting of representative proportions of the U.S. population in relation to SES, occupation, race, etc., as well as excellent reliabilities and validity.

It is a suitable measure for use with this population, assuming that subjects have an adequate command of English and that certain precautions are taken with the use of the instrument (as shall be explained later in this report).

Test of Non-Verbal Intelligence (TONI)

This instrument is derived from the same conceptual basis that instruments such as the European Raven's Progressive Matrices are built. Unlike its European counterpart, it has American norms and is appropriate for use with this population. It is designed for use as a measure of intellectual ability for populations for which it is not reasonable to use a verbal or written communication measure (as in the case of deaf, non-English speaking subjects, and culturally "different" subjects). Within the context of the total special education instrument package, its use is designed to be supplementary to that of the

WAIS-R. It has adequate technical properties for the purpose of its use in this case.

Adaptive

Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Battery Part 4: Scales of Independent Behavior

This instrument was selected to be used in combination with the ability measures to rule out the presence of mental retardation. Also, since P.L. 94-142 requires that in the assessment of mental retardation that no "single-instrument" be used in this determination, the use of this instrument in combination with others allows for technical compliance with federal mandates, as well as compliance with the intent of the law.

The use of an adaptive measure, such as the SIB, allows for the measurement not only of an individual's intellectual functioning, but of the subject's functional adaptive skills--those skills which allow an individual to function successfully in a home and community setting. It should be noted that the WJB instrument as a whole (of which the SIB is a part) is commonly noted to have excellent technical properties.

Achievement

Primary

Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Battery Part 2: Achievement

This device is a standardized measure of academic achievement offering a global achievement score as well as

cluster scores in reading, mathematics, written language, and content areas. It has excellent technical characteristics to include adequate norms (ages 3 to 80), reliability, and established validity.

Thinking that the use of such an instrument might be appropriate for our subjects, we considered using a measure of achievement normed on GED and ABE populations. We decided against using this device since: 1) there was some evidence that the norm group was an expectedly lower performing population; 2) our intent was to make predictions into the larger culture since our subjects must ultimately compete with the members of that culture; and, 3) the device (the ABLE) was intended for use in tracking students through GED programs or for program evaluation, and its instant use would therefore create measurement guesswork.

Secondary

Woodcock Reading Mastery Test

This device was intended for use in reading assessment. The SEP Project Manager used it as a "back-up" and support measure for the WJB. While the instrument has been justly criticized on the basis of item selection and item type, it--as do most Woodcock instruments--has excellent technical characteristics.

Key-Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Test

This device is a standardized measure of mathematics achievement. While its authors claim that it is both norm referenced and diagnostic, most educational assessment specialists know that it should only be used diagnostically since it does not have adequate normative or other technical characteristics.

The SEP Project Manager only used it diagnostically, and only as a supplement to the WJB when it was necessary to have a supplementary measure of mathematics achievement.

Test of Written Language (TOWL)

This instrument provides for separate scaled scores in the areas of spelling, handwriting, written mechanics, and thematic maturity as well as an overall language quotient presented as a standard score. It has adequate technical properties for use as a supplement to other academic measures of written language (the WJB).

Criterion-Referenced

Brigance Inventory of Essential Skills

This instrument is intended to be a diagnostic measure of academic achievement which is tied to curriculum rather than grade or age norms. While grade equivalent scores are offered, most educational assessment specialists do not use them since this test has no norms. The test has been justifiably criticized

because its author has made no attempt to assess its technical characteristics, arguing that it is criterion-referenced. The SEP Project Manager used this instrument only diagnostically, and only as a back-up to the WJB.

Social-Emotional

Child Behavior Profile--Teacher Report Form,
Youth Self-Report

Both of these devices are based on a standardized device assessing social-emotional dimensions of behavior called the Child Behavior Checklist. The CBC is noted by some to be one of the best if not the best instrument of its kind. The device is noted to have excellent technical characteristics.

While the norms of these devices are not appropriate for the HEP population, the Project Manager justified their use in this case in that they are only to be employed as screening devices for the purpose of referring a subject for further (SED) evaluation.

Other instruments available to us included:

The Developmental Test of Visual Motor Integration

The Peabody Individual Achievement Test

The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

These tests were considered inappropriate for our use for a number of reasons: the effect of cultural bias and technical inadequacy.

Plan for the Use of these Instruments in Making Special Education Eligibility Decisions

Learning Disabilities

P.L. 94-142 requires that in making an L.D. eligibility determination that a significant discrepancy be demonstrated between a subject's measured ability and achievement.

The L.D. eligibility decision was made primarily by examining the discrepancy between the performance scale of the selected ability measure (the WAIS-R) and the selected achievement battery (the WJB). At the same time we took data on the verbal side of the scale as well as computed a full scale I.Q.

We used the performance side of the scale only in examining discrepancy because most of the available literature on the assessment of ethnic minority populations (especially Hispanic subjects) indicates that while these subjects generally score in significantly less than average ranges on verbally loaded measures of ability (the enculturated elements of mental ability), they reasonably consistently score in average ranges on performance scales of mental ability (otherwise known as fluid intelligence or that which loads on "G").

Commonly, school psychologists will look at a significant discrepancy as being about a standard deviation difference between the two measures. For the most part, we adhered to this customary procedure.

Where the data indicated that not enough information was available using only these two devices, they were supplemented

with the secondary norm-referenced devices or the criterion-referenced device.

As an alternative method of assessing L.D. eligibility, the Oregon Administrative Rules regarding special education eligibility allowed for the determination to be made on the basis of a demonstrated perceptual processing deficit. A deficit of this nature is normally established by using a device which measures visual or visual motor processing such as the VMI (referenced earlier). While it is the opinion of the researcher that this is a technically inappropriate way of determining L.D. eligibility, it is in compliance with Oregon law and was used as an alternative method of making the decision.

Educable Mental Retardation

Federal and state laws regarding the assessment eligibility within this category specify that subjects score at least two standard deviations below the mean on a measure of intellectual ability and that the use of a measure of ability alone to make the determination of eligibility is forbidden.

In the assessment process for this category we used, as a primary measure of ability, the performance scale of the WAIS-R (the use of the performance scale alone in the assessment of ability for this population has been discussed earlier) supplemented by the Test of Non-Verbal Intelligence. We used, also, the SIB as a further safeguard of appropriate decision

making, since the instrument yields a score sensitive to adaptive functioning.

Finally, the use of the WJB achievement battery and other supplemental devices of that nature as deemed appropriate situationally, is recommended.

Severely Emotionally Disturbed

For this category, we initially screened for the purpose of making a referral for further evaluation. It is recommended that, as a screening device, use be made of a highly technically adequate, factor-analyzed instrument (which unfortunately has inappropriate norms for this population). The use of this instrument can, however, be justified for crude screening purposes. It is recommended, therefore, that the Teacher Report Form and the Youth Report Form of the Child Behavior Profile be used.

The Child Behavior Checklist, the original instrument, is thoroughly researched and considerable information can be derived from it. But since it is administered to parents and, in populations such as those in this study, there are insurmountable logistic and other problems relating to the collection of any data from the parents or friends of our subjects, its use is not recommended. The combined use of the YRF and the TRF of the Profile should provide an adequate indicator of whether or not to refer subjects for further assessment.

As was noted earlier, we have developed the capability to make the entire SED eligibility decision within our setting. The services of a certified School Psychologist who specializes in SED assessment have been obtained on a consultative basis to allow us to set up the assessment system and instrumentation.

The system, now in place, makes use of technical and procedural guidelines contained in the State of Oregon Technical Paper outlining procedures for making an SED eligibility decision, and involves the use of multiple-gating procedures to decrease the likelihood of producing errors within the decision-making process. The procedure involves the use of a number of instruments of different types, as well as the use of multiple respondents in different settings over time.

Speech/Language

We have established a working relationship with both Woodburn School District and Marion County ESD. As a result of this relationship, we have been obtaining services in Speech/Language assessment and eligibility decision making.

Other

All other eligibility decisions, as has been noted previously, are made in accordance with federal and state guidelines, utilizing existing community services when required (for example, as in the case of medical examinations, we contract with the community health clinic).

Other Considerations

This system of assessment for determining eligibility proved adequate for the needs of this study. However, as mentioned previously, it would be wise in any future case to collect a sufficient amount of data so that, at a minimum, it can be evaluated for normalcy before making any final decisions about eligibility or other related procedures.

APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Sex
Age
Marital Status
Number of Children
Veteran?
Handicapped?
Type of Handicapping Condition
Subject Considers Him(Her)self Handicapped?
Ethnic Group
Number of Family Members Living at Home
Grade at Withdrawal from School
Subject Considers Him(Her)self LEP?
Convicted of Breaking the Law?
On Probation of Parole?
Reason Subject Dropped Out of School
Subject's Plans After Getting GED
Previous Participation In GED Study?
Number of Previous GED Tests Taken
Referred for Evaluation?
Employed During School?
Previous Job Training?
Previous Jobs Council Program Participation?
Previous Social Security Assistance?
Previous Food Stamps Assistance?
Previous Welfare Recipient?
Previous Disability Recipient?
Previous Migrant Education Participant?

NAME: _____ No. _____

TIME START: _____ DATE QUESTIONNAIRE IS FILLED OUT: _____

TIME STOP: _____

PERSON WHO WILL KNOW YOUR WHEREABOUTS: _____

PERSON FILLING OUT QUESTIONNAIRE: - I have read my rights and given an informed consent to participate in this study. Also, I certify that I have given honest/truthful answers and that I have answered all questions.

Signature _____

PERSON TAKING DATA: - I certify that all of this information (name, date, answers) has been taken honestly and fairly and is correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signature _____

TO SUBJECTS AND OTHER CONCERNED PARTIES:

PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY IS VOLUNTARY.
RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY ARE PROTECTED UNDER AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION AND FEDERAL GUIDELINES CONCERNING RESEARCH IN EDUCATION.
THE INFORMATION OBTAINED BY WAY OF THIS DOCUMENT SHALL NOT BE USED FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN RESEARCH EXCEPT AS IT APPLIES TO PROGRAMMATIC ADAPTIONS BASED ON THE OUTCOMES OF THIS AND OTHER STUDIES BASED ON THIS DATA.
ALL DOCUMENTS, INCLUDING THIS ONE, SHALL BE MAINTAINED UNDER AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION AND FEDERAL STANDARDS RELATING TO CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.

DEAR STUDENT OR PAST STUDENT:

WE ARE ASKING YOU TO FILL OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE BECAUSE WE WISH TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE HEP SCHOOL, THE PROGRAM, AND PAST STUDENTS. WE ARE HOPING THAT BY LEARNING ABOUT THESE THINGS, WE MAY IMPROVE THE OPERATION OF THE SCHOOL SO THAT STUDENTS IN THE FUTURE MAY BENEFIT FROM THE PROGRAM. THUS, THE INFORMATION THAT WE GET FROM YOUR QUESTIONNAIRES WILL HELP US HELP OTHERS LIKE YOU. SOME OF THE QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT SCHOOL, SOME ARE ABOUT YOU OR YOUR OPINIONS AND ATTITUDES, SOME ARE ABOUT YOUR FAMILIES, THE COMMUNITY, ETC. - MOSTLY THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS, ONLY JUST YOUR OPINION OR WHAT YOU THINK. THE QUESTIONNAIRE WILL TAKE ABOUT AN HOUR TO FILL OUT. PLEASE GIVE YOUR MOST HONEST, TRUTHFUL ANSWERS INCLUDING ALL INFORMATION ABOUT YOURSELF (NAME,DATE,ETC.), AND PLEASE <u>ANSWER EVERY SINGLE QUESTION</u> AND LEAVE NO BLANKS. AFTER YOU HAVE FINISHED THE QUESTIONNAIRE, YOU WILL BE ASKED TO SIGN YOUR NAME ON THE COVER SHEET INDICATING THAT YOU HAVE GIVEN HONEST ANSWERS AND HAVE ANSWERED ALL QUESTIONS. THE PERSON GIVING YOU THE QUESTIONNAIRE WILL ALSO SIGN INDICATING THAT HE/SHE HAS OBTAINED YOUR ANSWERS HONESTLY AND FAIRLY. IF YOU NEED HELP READING OR UNDERSTANDING ANY QUESTION PLEASE ASK THE MONITOR AND HE/SHE WILL HELP YOU.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR HELPING US LEARN MORE ABOUT OUR STUDENTS AND OUR SCHOOL.

JUST AN ADDITIONAL NOTE:

YOU WILL FIND THAT SOME OF THE QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT SCHOOL AND YOU MAY NOT BE IN SCHOOL RIGHT NOW. IF YOU ARE NOT IN SCHOOL, PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS ABOUT SCHOOL AS YOU WOULD HAVE WHEN YOU WERE IN SCHOOL. FOR EXAMPLE, IF THE QUESTION ASKS YOU ABOUT SOMETHING THAT HAPPENED THE LAST WEEK OR YEAR OR MONTH OF SCHOOL, CONSIDER IT TO MEAN THE LAST WEEK OR YEAR OR MONTH YOU WERE THERE. YOU ALSO MAY WISH TO ANSWER CERTAIN QUESTIONS IN A GENERAL FASHION, OR WHAT YOU NORMALLY DID IN GENERAL. FOR EXAMPLE, IF A QUESTION ASKS YOU ABOUT HOW MANY TIMES YOU WERE SICK AND MISSED CLASSES IN SCHOOL, ANSWER IN A WAY THAT INDICATES WHAT WAS NORMAL OR AVERAGE FOR YOU. FINALLY, SOME QUESTIONS MAY ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR OPINION OF YOUR SCHOOL OR TEACHERS, ETC. WHEN THIS OCCURS, CONSIDER THE QUESTION TO BE ABOUT THE HEP SCHOOL. REMEMBER THAT WHILE YOU MAY NOT BE IN SCHOOL NOW, YOU WERE ONCE THERE NOT TOO LONG AGO, AND YOU SHOULD ANSWER QUESTIONS ABOUT SCHOOL AS YOU REMEMBER THE WAY YOU FELT OR THOUGHT THEN.

WHAT ABOUT YOU?

First, we want to ask some questions about you.

1. Are you: (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

   1 Female
   2 Male

2. How old were you on your last birthday? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

   1 13 years or younger
   2 14 years
   3 15 years
   4 16 years
   5 17 years
   6 18 years or older

3. What grade are you in? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

   1 9th (Freshman)
   2 10th (Sophomore)
   3 11th (Junior)
   4 12th (Senior)
   5 Not in school
   6 There are no grade levels in my school (or program)

4. How do you describe yourself? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

   1 American Indian or Alaskan Native
   2 Asian-American or Pacific Islander (Chinese, Japanese, Hawaiian, Laotian, etc.)
   3 Spanish-American (Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other Latin-American)
   4 Black or Afro-American
   5 Anglo (Caucasion)
   6 Other (Please write in here): _____
   7 Russian

5. How long have you lived in the house or apartment where you live now? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

   1 One year or less
   2 More than one year

6. How many different <u>schools</u> have you gone to?

Elementary School	1	2	3	4 or more
Junior High School	1	2	3	4 or more
High School	1	2	3	4 or more

7. Which of the following people live at home with you most of the time? (CIRCLE Y OR N FOR EACH LINE)

Yes	No	
Y	N	Father
Y	N	Mother
Y	N	Stepfather
Y	N	Stepmother
Y	N	Uncle
Y	N	Aunt
Y	N	Grandfather
Y	N	Grandmother
Y	N	Any other adult male
Y	N	Any other adult female

8. How satisfied are you with the way you are doing in school? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Very satisfied
2 Somewhat satisfied
3 Somewhat dissatisfied
4 Very dissatisfied

12. Compared to other students, how hard do you work in school? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Much harder
2 Harder
3 Less hard
4 Much less hard

13. How do most other students in your school see you?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH LINE)

	Very	Somewhat	Not at All
A good student	1	2	3
A trouble-maker?	1	2	3
Successful?	1	2	3

14. What study program are you in? (If you are no longer in school, what study program were you in before you stopped going to school?)
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 College Preparatory
2 Other, (not college preparatory/vocational/etc.)
3 Don't know

15. How would you rate yourself in reading ability compared to other students?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Top 10%
2 Above average
3 Below average

16. In the last four weeks, how many days did you cut school all day?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 None
2 1-2 days
3 3-5 days
4 6-10 days
5 More than 10 days

17. How often do you cut one or more of your classes?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Almost every day
2 Several times a week
3 About once a week
4 Once in a while
5 Almost never
6 Never

18. The following questions are about gangs and crime in the neighborhood where you live, and in your school. (CIRCLE Y OR N FOR EACH QUESTION)

Yes	No	
Y	N	Are there any gangs in the neighborhood where you live?
Y	N	Are there gang members at your school?
Y	N	Do gang members try to get you to join their gangs?
Y	N	Do gangs cause a lot of trouble in your school?
Y	N	In the last year has either of your parents been robbed on the streets of your neighborhood?
Y	N	In the last year has anyone broken into your home?

WHAT ABOUT YOUR GOALS IN SCHOOL AND FOR A JOB?

19. As things stand now, how far in school do you think you will get? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Quit as soon as I can
2 Less than high school graduation
3 High school graduation
4 Vocational, trade, or business school after completing high school
5 Less than two years of college
6 Finish a two-year college degree
7 Finish a four- or five-year college degree or more

20. Have you any career goals? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Yes
2 No

21. If yes, what job do you expect to have when you are 30 years old? (WRITE THE NAME OF THE JOB ON THE LINE BELOW)

_____

22. Which of the following best describes your parent's attitudes toward your continuing school after this year? (CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER)

	Mother	Father
Would like me to quit as soon as I can	1	1
Would not object to me leaving school before high school graduation	2	2
Would think I was foolish to try to go to college	3	3
Would think I was foolish if I did not try to go to college	4	4
Would object strongly to my leaving school before graduation from college	5	5

23. What do you think are your chances of getting ahead and being successful in your career goals? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Excellent
2 Fair
3 Somewhat limited
4 Not very good

24. Do you believe that what you are learning in school will help you achieve your career goals? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Yes
2 No

WHAT ABOUT YOUR PARENTS AND FAMILY

25. How far did your parents (or guardian) go in school?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

		Mother (or Guardian)	Father (or Guardian)
1	8th grade or less	1	2
2	Some high school	1	2
3	Finished high school	1	2
4	Some college or other schooling after high school	1	2
5	Finished college	1	2
6.	Don't know	1	2

26. What kind of work do your father (or stepfather) and mother (or stepmother) usually do? (For example: school teacher, paint sprayer, homemaker, engineer, farm hand, truck driver, secretary, lawyer.)
(WRITE THE NAME OF THEIR USUAL JOBS ON THE LINES BELOW)

Father's (or guardian's) job _____

Mother's (or guardian's) job _____

Don't know _____

27. Is your father (guardian) employed right now?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Yes--full-time
2 Yes--part-time
3 No

28. Is your mother (guardian) employed right now?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Yes--full-time
2 Yes--part-time
3 No

29. If I fail at something, how do my parents (guardians) usually respond?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Encourage me to try harder
2 Encourage me to try something else
3 Punish me
4 Do nothing

30. Are the following mostly true or mostly false about you? (CIRCLE T OR F FOR EACH STATEMENT)

True	False	
T	F	My parents or guardians almost always know where I am and what I am doing.
T	F	My parents or guardians keep close track of how well I am doing in school.
T	F	I do lots of things with my parents (guardians).
T	F	My parents (guardians) like to spend time with me.
T	F	My father is pretty satisfied with me.
T	F	My mother is pretty satisfied with me.
T	F	Have you defied your parent's authority (to their face)?
T	F	I have often gone against my parents' wishes.
T	F	My parents (or guardians) would be disappointed if I did not attend school regularly.

31. Do your parents want you to do more or less of the following things?

	Much less	About the same as I do now	Much more
My parents want me to:			
Take things seriously	1	2	3
Listen to my teacher	1	2	3
Try to be successful	1	2	3
Think about schoolwork	1	2	3

32. These questions are about your parents' attitudes toward various things at school. How wrong do your parents think the following are:

How wrong are the following to my parents?

	Very wrong	Wrong	A little bit wrong	Not wrong at all
Cutting classes	4	3	2	1
Dropping out of school	4	3	2	1
Not doing my homework	4	3	2	1
Goofing off in school	4	3	2	1
Hanging out with troublemakers	4	3	2	1

33. How do you think your parents and teachers see you?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH STATEMENT)

	Definitely yes	Somewhat	Not at all
Mother (or female guardian)			
As a troublemaker	1	2	3
As a good student	1	2	3
As needing help with school	1	2	3
As being independent	1	2	3
Father (or male guardian)			
As a troublemaker	1	2	3
As a good student	1	2	3
As needing help with school	1	2	3
As being independent	1	2	3
Most Teachers			
As a troublemaker	1	2	3
As a good student	1	2	3
As needing help with school	1	2	3
As being independent	1	2	3

34. How much do you want to be like the kind of person your parents (or guardians) are?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH APPROPRIATE PERSON)

	Mother (or Guardian)	Father (or Guardian)	Guardian
Very much like him/her	1	2	3
Somewhat like him/her	1	2	3
A little like him/her	1	2	3
Not very much like him/her	1	2	3
Not at all like him/her	1	2	3

35. How close do you feel to your parents (or guardians)?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH APPROPRIATE PERSON)

	Mother (or Guardian)	Father (or Guardian)	Guardian
Extremely close	1	2	3
Quite close	1	2	3
Fairly close	1	2	3
Not very close	1	2	3

HOW DO YOU SPEND YOUR TIME?

Now we want to ask some questions about the way you spend your time in and out of school.

37. Do you have a regular part-time or full-time job for which you get paid? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

    1 Yes--regular full-time
    2 Yes--regular part-time
    3 No

38. How many hours per week do you work at a job? _____

39. How many hours per week do you work at family responsibilities? _____

40. How much time do you usually spend after school hanging out with a group of friends? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

    1 None
    2 Less than 1 hour
    3 1-2 hours
    4 More than 2 hours

41. How much time, on the average, do you spend doing homework outside school? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

    1 None, or almost none
    2 About half an hour a day
    3 One to two hours a day
    4 Three hours or more a day

42. How true about you are the following statements? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH STATEMENT)

Nearly always true	Sometimes	Nearly always false	
1	2	3	I turn my homework in on time.
1	2	3	My school work is messy.
1	2	3	I don't bother with homework or class assignments.
1	2	3	If a teacher gives a lot of homework, I try to finish all of it.

NOW WHAT ABOUT YOUR FRIENDS?

These next questions are about your friends. Please answer the following questions about your friends.

43. When you spend time with friends, do you usually spend it with the same group, or do you mostly spend time with different friends? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Mostly the same group
2 Mostly different friends

44. How much do you want to be like the kind of person your best friend is? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Very much like my friend
2 Somewhat like my friend
3 A little like my friend
4 Not very much like my friend
5 Not at all like my friend

45. Who has more influence over you: Your friend, or your parents (guardians)? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 My friends
2 My parents (guardians)

46. If your friends wanted to go out and your parents wanted you to stay home for the evening, what do you think you would do?

1 Go out
2 Stay home

47. Are the following statements mostly true or false about your friends? (CIRCLE T OR F FOR EACH STATEMENT)

True	False	
T	F	Most of my friends think getting good grades is important.
T	F	Most of my friends think school is a pain.
T	F	My friends often try to get me to do things the teacher doesn't like.
T	F	Most of my friends smoke cigarettes.
T	F	My friends discourage me from smoking cigarettes.

48. Please think of your best friend in this school. As far as you know, are the following statements true or false about him or her? (CIRCLE T OR F FOR EACH STATEMENT)

True	False	
T	F	Is interested in school
T	F	Attends classes regularly
T	F	Plans to go to college
T	F	Belongs to a gang
T	F	Gets in trouble with the police

49. Have any of your friends quit school?

1 None
2 One
3 Two or three
4 Four or more

50. How about your best friend? Is he or she still in school?

1 Yes
2 No, quit school before high school graduation
3 No, graduated from high school

51. How far have your brothers or sisters gone in school?

1 Graduated
2 Dropped out before graduation
3 Still in school
4 I have no brothers and sisters

52. How many of your friends have been picked up by the police? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 None
2 One
3 Some
4 Most
5 All
6 Don't know

YOUR SCHOOL

Now we want to ask about your school.

53. How often is your school like this?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH STATEMENT)

	Not usually	Some-times	Almost always
Students are treated like children here.	1	2	3
Everyone knows what the school rules are.	1	2	3
The school rules are fair.	1	2	3
The punishment for breaking school rules is the same no matter who you are.	1	2	3
Students can get an unfair school rule changed.	1	2	3
Teachers treat students with respect.	1	2	3
Teachers do things that make students feel "put down."	1	2	3

54. Do you mostly agree or disagree with the following statements about your school? (CIRCLE A OR D FOR EACH STATEMENT)

	Agree	Disagree
Students have little say in how this school is run.	A	D
Teachers sometimes change their lesson plans because of student suggestions.	A	D
This school hardly ever tries anything new.	A	D
Students are seldom asked to help solve a problem the school is having.	A	D
I have lots of respect for my teachers.	A	D
Teachers here care about the students.	A	D
I feel like I belong in this school.	A	D
This school makes me like to learn.	A	D
Students of different races get on very well in this school.	A	D

55. How often are your classes like this?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH STATEMENT)

	Almost never	Some-times	Almost always
In most of my classes everyone knows what the classroom rules are.	1	2	3
Most of my teachers run their class-rooms with a firm hand.	1	2	3
The rules in most of my classes are fair.	1	2	3
In most of my classes, if a rule is broken, students know what kind of punishment will follow.	1	2	3
When a student misbehaves in class his or her grade is lowered.	1	2	3

56. Are the following statements mostly true or mostly false about your school? (CIRCLE T OR F FOR EACH STATEMENT)

	True	False
Students of different races usually end up in different classes.	T	F
This school has special classes for slow learners.	T	F
It is hard to change the way things are done in this school.	T	F
There are special classes for troublemakers.	T	F

57. How important is each of the following to you? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH LINE)

	Very Important	Fairly Important	Not Important
What teachers think about you	1	2	3
The grades you get at school	1	2	3

58. How important is each of the following to your teachers? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH LINE)

	Very Important	Fairly Important	Not Important
That you do well in school?	1	2	3
That you study hard?	1	2	3
That you stay in school?	1	2	3

59. How much do you agree with the following statements? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH STATEMENT)

	Very Much	Pretty Much	A Little	Not at All
In school I learn about things I want to know.	1	2	3	4
School gives me a chance to learn many interesting things.	1	2	3	4
When I'm in school I feel I'm doing something that is really worthwhile.	1	2	3	4
In school I am improving my ability to think and solve problems.	1	2	3	4
In school I am learning the things I will need to know to be a good citizen.	1	2	3	4
I can learn more from a good job than I can at school.	1	2	3	4
I am learning things in school that will help me get a good job in the future.	1	2	3	4

	Very Much	Pretty Much	A Little	Not at All
I am bored by school.	1	2	3	4
Teachers are unfair to certain students.	1	2	3	4
I have nothing interesting to do outside of school.	1	2	3	4
The students are very unfriendly to me.	1	2	3	4

60. Are the following statements mostly true or false about your school? (CIRCLE T OR F FOR EACH STATEMENT)

	True	False
The teachers let the students know what they expect of them.	T	F
The director lets the students know what he or she expects of them.	T	F
Students have helped to make the school rules.	T	F
Teachers don't call on me in class even when I raise my hand.	T	F
Teachers don't ask me to work on special classroom projects.	T	F
I'm not asked to take part in school activities as much as I want to be.	T	F
The director is fair.	T	F
The director runs the school with a firm hand.	T	F
I often feel nervous at school.	T	F
When I'm late for class I feel very anxious.	T	F
I find it hard to talk in front of a class.	T	F

61. How often do the following things happen to you in your school? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH STATEMENT)

	Often	Sometimes	Hardly Ever
Teachers say nice things about my classwork.	1	2	3
I talk to some of my teachers about things other than schoolwork.	1	2	3
Teachers help me with schoolwork outside of class.	1	2	3
I get a chance to do the things that I can do well.	1	2	3
I have a learning plan that was made just for me.	1	2	3
I can work at my own speed in class.	1	2	3

62. In the last month have any of these things happened to you in school? (CIRCLE Y OR N FOR EACH STATEMENT)

	Yes	No
Did you get to do something special as a reward?	Y	N
Were you sent out of class for punishment?	Y	N
Did you have to stay after school as a punishment?	Y	N
Did you get an extra assignment as a punishment?	Y	N
Did you win an award or a prize because of your work in school?	Y	N
Did you win an award or prize for something that you did other than schoolwork?	Y	N
Was your grade lowered on an assignment as a punishment?	Y	N
Did you help win an award or a prize for your group or class because of your work in school?	Y	N

63. Next, we are asking some questions about how you feel about your school. How do you feel about the following? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH LINE)

	Like	Don't Like
This school	1	2
The director	1	2
The classes you are taking	1	2
The teachers	1	2
The counselors	1	2

64. These questions are all about YOUR BEHAVIORS, AND THINGS YOU DO in school. Read them carefully. (ANSWER BY CIRCLING YES OR NO)

Do you often look out of the classroom window?	YES	NO
Is your work usually neat?	YES	NO
Do you nearly always answer if the teacher asks you a question?	YES	NO
Do you find it difficult to sit still for a long time?	YES	NO
Is your writing easy to read?	YES	NO
Do your books get scruffy quickly?	YES	NO
Are you usually quiet in class?	YES	NO
Do you nearly always put your hand up if a teacher asks a question?	YES	NO
Do you sometimes daydream?	YES	NO
Have you been punished by a teacher quite often?	YES	NO
Have you been in any fights or arguments with other students?	YES	NO
Do you sometimes stay behind after the lesson ends to talk with the teacher?	YES	NO
Do you walk quietly about the school?	YES	NO
When the teacher is talking, do you always pay attention?	YES	NO

Do you ever ask the teacher questions?	YES	NO
Can you keep on working for a long time?	YES	NO
Do you usually have all the books and other things you need for lessons?	YES	NO
Do you sometimes leave work unfinished?	YES	NO
Do you mostly work on your own without needing help?	YES	NO
Do you ever push other boys or girls about?	YES	NO
If you can't do the work, do you ask the teacher for help?	YES	NO
Do you always do as you are told without complaining?	YES	NO
Do you often start work again because you went wrong?	YES	NO
Do you answer back if a teacher gets angry with you?	YES	NO
Do you sometimes disrupt the class?	YES	NO
Do you sometimes shout out answers before you are asked?	YES	NO
Do you argue with your teachers?	YES	NO
Do you "goof-off" in class so that other students can't work?	YES	NO
Have you copied someone else's assignments?	YES	NO
Have you cheated on tests in school?	YES	NO
Do you come late to class?	YES	NO
Do you do things that you know will make the teacher angry?	YES	NO
Do you come to school late?	YES	NO

65. Sometimes bad things happen to a person. Have any of the following things happened to you during the past year? Think of your last 12 months at school.
(CIRCLE Y OR N FOR EACH LINE)

	Yes	No
Did anyone steal something worth less than $1 from your desk, locker, or other place at school?	Y	N
Did anyone steal something worth more than $1 from your desk, locker, or other place at school?	Y	N
Did anyone physically attack or hurt you?	Y	N
Did anyone force you to hand over money or things worth less than $1?	Y	N
Did anyone take money or things worth $1 or more directly from you by force, weapons or threats?	Y	N
Did anyone threaten you with a beating?	Y	N
Did anyone threaten you with a knife or gun?	Y	N

66. Do you usually stay away from any of the following because someone might hurt or bother you there?
(CIRCLE Y OR N FOR EACH LINE)

	Yes	No
The shortest way to school	Y	N
Any entrances into the school	Y	N
Any hallways or stairs in the school	Y	N
Parts of the school cafeteria	Y	N
Any school restrooms	Y	N
Other places inside the school building	Y	N
Other places on the school grounds	Y	N

67. Here are some questions about your school. How strongly do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?
(CIRCLE A, U OR SD FOR EACH STATEMENT)

	Strongly Agree	Undecided	Strongly Disagree
Students at my school can choose harder or easier courses, as best fits their needs.	A	U	SD
Students in alternative courses in this school feel like outsiders, and put down.	A	U	SD
In this school, the color of your skin doesn't mean much, we are all friends.	A	U	SD
When a student has problems, the school works out a plan to help that student.	A	U	SD
The school program is appropriate for ethnic and minority groups.	A	U	SD
Students are able to proceed at their own rate in most courses.	A	U	SD
Some students in this school are favored more than others.	A	U	SD
Students of different races and backgrounds get along well with each other.	A	U	SD

68. During the last semester and also this semester in school, have you:
(CIRCLE Y OR N FOR EACH LINE)

	Yes	No
Had to fight to protect yourself?	Y	N
Seen a teacher threatened by a student?	Y	N
Seen a teacher hit or attacked by a student?	Y	N
Seen a student hit or attacked by a teacher?	Y	N
Been suspended from this school?	Y	N

69. The following questions ask about how often you feel safe in school and also on the way to school.
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION)

Almost Always	Sometimes	Almost Never	
1	2	3	How often do you feel safe while in your school building?
1	2	3	How often are you afraid that someone will hurt or bother you at school?
1	2	3	How often are you afraid that someone will hurt or bother you on the way to or from school?

70. Do your teachers make you feel comfortable enough to ask them for help if you are having a difficult time in a class?

1 Very much
2 Pretty much
3 A little
4 Not at all

71. Please answer the following questions as honestly as you can. Use the "?" if you are not sure of your opinion.

Yes	?	No	
Y	?	N	Is most of the school day a waste of time?
Y	?	N	Do you think that most people who drop out of school before graduation will be sorry someday?
Y	?	N	Is what you learn in school useful outside of school?
Y	?	N	Do you sometimes feel that you would like to quit school?
Y	?	N	Do you think kids should have to go to school even if they don't want to?
Y	?	N	Is there one class that you really enjoy going to each day?
Y	?	N	Are most of your classes interesting?
Y	?	N	Do you enjoy studying?

72. How well do you like to read?

1 Not at all
2 Not very much
3 It's okay
4 Pretty good

73. What kind of learner are you in most things?

1 Below average
2 Average
3 Above average
4 Very good
5 One of the best

74. If you really wanted to, do you think you could learn enough to do the following things?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH LINE)

	No	Maybe	Probably	Yes
Could you ever learn enough to be a doctor?	1	2	3	4
Could you ever learn enough to fix typewriters?	1	2	3	4
Could you ever learn enough to be a math teacher?	1	2	3	4
Could you ever learn enough to write a good book?	1	2	3	4
Could you ever learn enough to be a nurse?	1	2	3	4
Could you ever learn enough to fix a car motor?	1	2	3	4

75. What kind of learner do your teachers think you are?

1 Below average
2 Average
3 Above average
4 Very good
5 One of the best

76. Whose fault is it if you do poorly in school?

1 All the teacher's fault
2 Mostly the teacher's fault
3 About half my fault, half the teacher's
4 Mostly my fault
5 All my fault

77. Please answer the following questions as honestly as you can. If you can't answer "YES" or "NO," mark the "?"

Yes	?	No	
Y	?	N	My parent's opinions are valued by the school.
Y	?	N	I can determine what I study.
Y	?	N	I can change my school program if it is not right for me.
Y	?	N	In school I can make some decisions about what and how I learn.
Y	?	N	I have enough opportunities to choose subjects that I like.
Y	?	N	My counselor knows me on an individual basis.
Y	?	N	I communicate and work effectively with my counselor.
Y	?	N	My parents are involved in the school program.
Y	?	N	My parents share joint responsibility with the school for my education.

78. I feel very close to:

1 All my teachers
2 Most of my teachers
3 About half of my teachers
4 Few of my teachers
5 None of my teachers

79. How many parent-student-teacher conferences did you participate in last year?

1 None
2 One
3 Two
4 Three
5 Four or more

80. This year have your teachers given you enough counseling in:

Yes	?	No	
Y	?	N	Deciding what is important in life?
Y	?	N	Deciding what I want to achieve in life?
Y	?	N	Learning about jobs and careers?
Y	?	N	Learning about getting along with other students?
Y	?	N	Planning what courses to take in school?
Y	?	N	Solving personal problems?

WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE?

Now we want to ask your opinions about things. Some people think one way about these things, and some people think another way. There are no right or wrong answers. We want to know what you think.

81. How much do you agree with the following statements? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH STATEMENT)

Very Much	Pretty Much	A Little	Not at All	
1	2	3	4	All people should have at least a high school education.
1	2	3	4	An education will help me to be a mature adult.
1	2	3	4	A high school diploma is the only way to get ahead.
1	2	3	4	Once I have decided on a course of action I stick with it.
1	2	3	4	I stop to consider whether or not what I am doing is helping me to achieve my goals.
1	2	3	4	It is worthwhile to drop out of school and get a job.

82. Here are some more things people think different ways about. Do you think they are mostly true or mostly false? (CIRCLE T OR F FOR EACH STATEMENT)

True	False	
T	F	All in all, I am pretty much able to take care of myself without help from my parents or guardians.
T	F	If I wanted to, I could make enough money to get along on my own.
T	F	I am going to need my parents' or guardians' help for some time to come.
T	F	I read several whole books every day.
T	F	I sometimes get angry.
T	F	I know how to get along with teachers.
T	F	Sometimes I think I am no good at all.
T	F	If I want to, I can explain things well.
T	F	I like to have fun.
T	F	I find it easy to talk with all kinds of people.
T	F	My friends regard me as a person with good sense.
		Getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.

83. Do you think these next things are mostly true or mostly false?

True	False	
T	F	Taking things from stores doesn't hurt anyone.
T	F	I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
T	F	Everytime I try to get ahead, something or someone stops me.
T	F	Whether or not I spend time on homework is my own business.
T	F	I should not have to explain to anyone how I spend my money.
T	F	It is okay to take advantage of a chump or a sucker.
T	F	These days I get the feeling that I'm just not a part of things.
T	F	I would do almost anything on a dare.
T	F	I go out of my way to meet trouble rather than try to escape it.
T	F	I don't think I'm quite as happy as others seem to be.

84. What do you think about the following statements? Are they mostly true or mostly false? (CIRCLE T OR F FOR EACH STATEMENT)

True	False	
T	F	My parents (guardians) ask my advice about family decisions.
T	F	My father (or guardian) helps me with my homework.
T	F	My parents (guardians) tell me who I can and can't have as friends.
T	F	My parents (guardians) would be very angry if I lied to them.
T	F	I am not the kind of person you would expect to get in trouble with the law.
T	F	Life in this town is pretty confusing.
T	F	I feel sad a lot of the time.
T	F	Getting a good job is mostly a matter of being in the right place at the right time.
T	F	I do not mind stealing from someone--that is just the kind of person I am.
T	F	It is alright to get around the law if you can.
T	F	I have never disliked anyone.
T	F	People who leave things around deserve it if their things get taken.
T	F	I feel no one really cares much about what happens to me.
T	F	I have a clear picture of what I am like as a person.
T	F	I worry about lots of little things.
T	F	I don't like anybody telling me what to do.
T	F	No one knows how I really feel about them.
T	F	It is better if students of different races go to different schools.
T	F	I have a steady girlfriend or boyfriend.

85. What do you think about the following statements? Are they mostly true or mostly false? (CIRCLE T OR F FOR EACH STATEMENT)

True	False	
T	F	I have lots of respect for my parents or guardians.
T	F	My mother (or guardian) helps me with my homework.
T	F	My parents (guardians) appreciate it when I try hard, even if I don't succeed all the time.
T	F	It is easy to get along with nasty people.
T	F	I often feel awkward and out of place.
T	F	I like myself.
T	F	Teachers who are hassled by students usually have it coming.

86. Do you think these statements are mostly true or mostly false? (CIRCLE T OR F FOR EACH STATEMENT)

True	False	
T	F	I am the kind of person who will always be able to make it if I try.
T	F	I would not care if my parents or guardians were a little disappointed in me.
T	F	My parents (or guardians) would be angry if I disobeyed them.
T	F	My parents or guardians would be disappointed if I stole something from a store.
T	F	I would be punished at home if my parents or guardians knew I broke a school rule.
T	F	I do not have much to lose by causing trouble in school.
T	F	My teachers think that I am a slow learner.
T	F	I do lots of things with the same group of friends.
T	F	I often feel tense.
T	F	Much of what happens to me is just a matter of chance.
T	F	Luck is more important than hard work.
T	F	I know someone at school I could go to if I were just feeling down.
T	F	Life is mostly a gamble.

87. What do you think about the following statements? Are they mostly true or mostly false? (CIRCLE T OR F FOR EACH LINE)

True	False	
T	F	I have usually found that what is going to happen will happen no matter what I do.
T	F	Most of my close friends are good friends with each other.

True	False	
T	F	There are students at this school who will really help me if I have a problem.
T	F	Friends at school come to me when they have problems or need advice.
T	F	I often feel lonely.
T	F	I don't like anybody telling me what to do.
T	F	Whether or not I spend time on homework is my own business.

88. Do you know how to do the following things?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH LINE)

Yes	Not Sure	No	
1	2	3	Apply for an office job in a big company?
1	2	3	Apply for a job in a factory?
1	2	3	Choose the right school program to help you in your career?
1	2	3	Apply to a college for admission?
1	2	3	Find out about different kinds of jobs?
1	2	3	Arrange a bus or train trip to go out of town?
1	2	3	Balance a checkbook?

89. How much do you like each of the following? Think of the way you feel and of how much you want, or don't want each of these things.

How strongly do I like:	Like Very Much	Like	Don't Like Very Much
To be able to decide for myself how to spend my free time?	1	2	3
To dress the way that pleases me though others may not dress that way?	1	2	3
To be free to say exactly what I think when I'm with other people?	1	2	3
To be free to make my own plans now about what I'm going to do with my life?	1	2	3
To be free to decide for myself what movies to see or books to read?	1	2	3

	Like Very Much	Like	Don't Like Very Much
To choose my own clothes and personal possessions without having to get advice from others?	1	2	3
To be considered mature enough to use good judgment in different situations?	1	2	3
To be free to use the money I have in whatever way I choose?	1	2	3
To be free to try new things on my own if they interest me?	1	2	3

90. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements. We want to know your feelings.

	Strongly Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I sometimes feel uncertain about who I really am.	3	2	1
I often wonder whether I am becoming the kind of person I want to be.	3	2	1
It's hard to know how to act most of the time since you can't tell what most people expect.	3	2	1
Most people don't seem to accept me when I'm just being myself.	3	2	1
Hardly anyone I know is interested in how I really feel inside.	3	2	1
I generally feel that I have a lot of interests in common with the other kids in school.	3	2	1
I often feel alone even when I am with other people.	3	2	1
If I had my choice I would like for my life to be very different than it is.	3	2	1
I feel in tune with the people around me.	3	2	1

	Strongly Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree
No one really knows me very well.	3		2		1
I can always find friends when I want to.	3		2		1

91. Whether you do well or poorly in school depends. . . (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1 Completely on luck
2 Mostly luck, partly hard work
3 Half luck and half hard work
4 Partly on luck, mostly on hard work
5 Completely on hard work

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

Which of the following is most true of you right now?:
(circle the number of the one you choose)

1) I am employed in other than seasonal or migrant work

2) I am now a seasonal or migrant worker

3) I am now going to school

4) I am unemployed at this time

5) I am both working as a migrant/seasonal laborer and am going to school

A NOTE ABOUT THE LAST PART OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

THE QUESTIONS IN THIS LAST PART OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE (YOU ARE FINALLY ALMOST DONE - WHEW!) ARE MOSTLY ABOUT JOB SKILLS AND WORKING. SPECIFICALLY THEY ARE ABOUT THINGS THAT WERE TAUGHT IN A COURSE AT THE HEP SCHOOL. YOU ARE ASKED TO RATE YOURSELF AS WEAK (A #1) OR STRONG (A #5) FOR THE SKILL IN EACH QUESTION. SOME OR MOST OF THE QUESTIONS MAY BE UNFAMILIAR TO YOU OR MAY NOT MAKE MUCH SENSE. IF THAT IS THE CASE IT MEANS THAT YOU HAVE <u>PROBABLY NOT TAKEN THE COURSE</u> AND YOU SHOULD RATE YOURSELF AS <u>WEAK</u> (A #1 OR #2). FOR EXAMPLE, IF A QUESTION ASKS YOU ABOUT THE "QUEST" SYSTEM AND YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT THAT IS, THEN RATE YOURSELF AS <u>WEAK</u>. BUT IF YOU HAVE <u>HAD</u> THE COURSE, YOU WILL <u>UNDERSTAND</u> THE QUESTIONS, AND IF YOU THINK YOU <u>HAVE</u> THE SKILL, YOU SHOULD RATE YOURSELF AS <u>STRONG</u>. REMEMBER THAT IF YOU DO NOT HAVE A PARTICULAR SKILL OR UNDERSTAND A PARTICULAR QUESTION IT DOES <u>NOT</u> MEAN THAT SOMETHING IS WRONG WITH YOU, IT JUST MEANS THAT YOU <u>HAVEN'T HAD THE COURSE</u> AND SHOULDN'T HAVE THE SKILL SO YOU WILL RATE YOURSELF AS WEAK ON THE SKILL.

Dear Student or Ex-Student,

The following is a list of skills/competencies which a person seeking employment might wish to develop for himself/herself.

Would you please rate what you think your skills/competencies are from weak (1) to strong (5) for each item listed in each category.

Some of these competencies/skills may not be familiar to you. If this is the case, rate yourself as low or weak in this area (a 1 or a 2). If you have much of the skill/competency, rate yourself as high or strong in that area (4 or 5). If you are average, give yourself a 3.

This information is being collected from students and past students of the HEP school so that students in the future may benefit programatically from the experiences of past and present students. Thank you for your help.

WRITING A RESUME					
1. I know why a resume is important	1	2	3	4	5
2. I know what information should be included in a resume, and the Do's and Don'ts of resume writing.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I have developed a resume and received a printed copy.	1	2	3	4	5
IDENTIFYING PERSONAL SKILLS					
4. I can define and identify skills, aptitudes, interests, and hobbies.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I can identify accomplishments and the skills used to achieve them.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I can relate skills, aptitudes, and interests to corresponding jobs and careers.	1	2	3	4	5
USING THE TELEPHONE					
7. I have knowledge of telephone techniques used to contact a potential employer for job search.	1	2	3	4	5
JOB SOURCES					
8. I know where to find jobs.	1	2	3	4	5

ATTENDANCE AND PUNCTUALITY

9. I know the results of poor attendance at the work place.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I can formulate my own values and accountability at the work place.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I have learned the importance of being on time and the consequences of being late at the work place.	1	2	3	4	5

IDENTIFYING INTERESTS

A. COPS Option

12. I have identified my interest in 14 career clusters	1	2	3	4	5
13. I have explored the career clusters with the highest interest ratings.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I have identified 3 potential occupations of interest from number 13 above.	1	2	3	4	5

CIS Option

15. I have completed the QUEST portion of the Career Information System	1	2	3	4	5
16. I have used the computer to input my responses to QUEST to obtain my occupational list.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I have identified 3 potential occupations from the list, or (if 3 are not given), I have changed my responses to some of the QUEST questions so as to receive 3 potential occupations.	1	2	3	4	5

COMPLETING A JOB APPLICATION

18. I have gained knowledge to complete a job application correctly.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I am aware of the Do's and Don'ts of completing a job application.	1	2	3	4	5

INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION					
20. I know why communication skills are important	1	2	3	4	5
21. I have gained knowledge of 9 key elements to better communication.	1	2	3	4	5
JOB KEEPING ATTITUDES					
22. I can define attitudes.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I have gained knowledge of the attitudes that employers hold as important for their employees.	1	2	3	4	5
JOB EXPECTATIONS AND QUITTING THE JOB					
24. I have knowledge of employer expectations.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I have knowledge of employee expectations.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I have knowledge of the appropriate reasons and methods for quitting a job.	1	2	3	4	5
APPEARANCE					
27. I have an understanding of the importance of a neat, clean appearance.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I can distinguish between dressing for the interview and dressing for the job.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I have learned how appearance plays an important part in first impressions.	1	2	3	4	5
INTERVIEWING FOR THE JOB					
30. I have knowledge of acceptable job interview behaviors.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I have knowledge of inappropriate job interview behaviors.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I have knowledge of what should be done to prepare for the interview.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I know the importance of gaining knowledge about the company and job prior to the interview.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I understand what employers look for during the interview.	1	2	3	4	5

35. I know how to respond to difficult questions.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I understand the importance of and the elements of a follow-up letter.	1	2	3	4	5
YOUR JOB SEARCH					
37. I understand the importance of developing a job search strategy or plan.	1	2	3	4	5
38. I am aware of the elements of a successful job search plan.	1	2	3	4	5
39. I am aware of the time factors involved in a job search program.	1	2	3	4	5
40. I am aware of the facts and myths of looking for a job.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I can develop or use a job leads list	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX E

LIST AND DESCRIPTION OF SCALES
Item Content and Psychometric Reliabilities

In this appendix we describe the scales used in the research. Each scale described in the following pages is composed of items in the questionnaire administered to three student enrollment waves (114 subjects) between January, 1986, and October, 1987.

The present scales have been built mainly upon the following work:

1. Brennan, Tim; Huizinga, David; and Elliott, Delbert S. The Social Psychology of Runaways. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co., 1978

2. Dennis, P. T.; Coulter, D. K.; and Harms, N. High School Improvement Program: Report on Project 374 of ESEA Title 4-C. 1979

3. Eliott, D.S. and Voss, H.L. Delinquency and Drop-Out. Lexington, 1974

4. Gottfredson, Gary; Gottfredson, Denise C.; and Cook, Michael. The School Action Effectiveness Study Report Nos. 325 and 342. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools, 1983

5. Jessor, Richard and Jessor, Shirley L. Problem Behavior and Psychosocial Development. New York, NY: Academic Press, 1977

6. Natriello, Gary, "School Dropouts: Patterns and Policies," Teachers College Record, Volume 87, Number 3. 1986

7. Nye, F. Ivan. Family Relationships. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1982

B66 - SELF ESTEEM (ALPHA = .6649)

1. Sometimes I think I am no good at all.
2. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
3. I like myself.
4. These days I get the feeling that I'm just not a part of things.
5. I don't think I'm quite as happy as others seem to be.
6. I feel sad a lot of the time.

7. I am the kind of person who will always be able to make it if I try.

B64 - EMOTIONAL ISOLATION (ALPHA = .8828)

1. I often feel lonely.
2. No one knows how I really feel about them.
3. Most people don't seem to accept me when I'm just being myself.
4. There are students at this school who will really help me if I have a problem.
5. Hardly anyone I know is interested in how I really feel inside.
6. I often feel alone even when I am with other people.
7. I feel in tune with the people around me.
8. I feel no one really cares much about what happens to me.
9. I know someone at school I could go to if I were just feeling down.

B62 - SOCIAL ISOLATION - GENERAL (ALPHA = .5748)

1. How much time do you usually spend after school hanging out with a group of friends?
2. I do lots of things with the same group of friends.
3. How many friends do you have?
4. Do you have a best friend or a friend that you feel close to?
5. I can always find friends when I want to.

B65 - NORMLESSNESS (ALPHA = .6692)

1. Taking things from stores doesn't hurt anyone.
2. It is O.K. to take advantage of a chump or a sucker.
3. I am not the kind of person you would expect to get in trouble with the law.
4. I do not mind stealing from someone, that's just the kind of person I am.

5. It is all right to get around the law if you can.

6. People who leave things around deserve it if their things get taken.

7. Teachers who are hassled by students usually have it coming.

8. I do not have much to lose by causing trouble in school.

B68 - INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE (ALPHA = .6290)

1. I find it hard to talk in front of class.

2. I know how to get along with teachers.

3. If I want to, I can explain things well.

4. I find it easy to talk with all kinds of people.

5. My friends regard me as a person with good sense.

6. I often feel awkward and out of place.

7. I often feel tense.

8. I worry about lots of little things.

9. I often feel nervous at school.

B67 - LEARNER SELF ESTEEM (ALPHA = .7507)

1. What kind of learner are you in most things?

2. How would you rate yourself in reading ability compared to other students?

B26 - BELIEF IN THE VALUE OF SCHOOLING (IDEOLOGY OF EDUCATION) (ALPHA = .8014)

1. Do you agree that having a high school diploma is the only way to get ahead?

2. Do you agree that all people should have at least a high school education?

3. I am learning things in school that will help me get a good job in the future.

4. Do you believe that what you are learning in school will help you achieve your career goals?

5. I can learn more from a good job than I can at school.

6. Is what you learn in school useful outside of school?

7. Do you agree that an education will help you to be a mature adult?

G7 - ATTACHMENT TO SCHOOL (ALPHA = .6580)

1. Do you care about how your teachers see you?

2. How do you feel about school, like or dislike?

3. How do you feel about the principal, like or dislike?

4. How do you feel about the classes you are taking, like or dislike?

5. How do you feel about the teachers, like or dislike?

6. How do you feel about the counselors, like or dislike?

7. I have lots of respect for my teachers.

8. This school makes me like to learn.

9. How important is it to you personally to get good grades?

10. In school I learn things I want to know.

G10 - INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL (ALPHA = .7011)

1. I have spent time on intramural athletic teams during this school term, yes or no.

2. I have spent time on other athletic teams - in or out of school, during this school term, yes or no.

3. I have spent time on cheerleading, pep club or majorettes during this school term, yes or no.

4. I have spent time in debating or drama during this school term, yes or no.

5. I have spent time in band or orchestra during this school term, yes or no.

6. I have spent time in chorus or dance during this school term, yes or no.

7. I have spent time in school clubs during this school term, yes or no.

8. I have spent time working on the school newspaper, magazine, yearbook or annual during this school term, yes or no.

9. I have spent time in student council, student government, or political clubs during this school term, yes or no.

10. I have spent time in youth organizations in the community, such as Scouts, Y, etc. during this school term, yes or no.

11. I have spent time in church activities, including youth groups during this school term, yes or no.

12. I have spent time helping out at school as a library assistant, office helper, etc. during this term, yes or no.

13. How much time on average, do you spend doing homework outside school?

14. Do you have a regular paid job? No, Part-time, Full-time?

B70 - VALUE FOR INDEPENDENCE (ALPHA = .8661)

1. How strongly do you like to be able to decide for yourself how to spend your free time?

2. How strongly do you like to dress the way that pleases you, though others may not dress that way?

3. How strongly do you like to be free to say exactly what you think when you're with other people?

4. How strongly do you like to be free to make your own plans now about what you're going to do with your life?

5. How strongly do you like to be free to decide for yourself what movies to see or books to read?

6. How strongly do you like to be able to choose your own clothes and personal possessions without having to get advice from others?

7. How strongly do you like to be considered mature enough to use good judgment in different situations?

8. How strongly do you like to be free to use the money you have in whatever way I choose?

9. How strongly do you like to be free to try new things on your own if they interest you?

G12 - PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE (ALPHA = .7305)

1. You know how to apply for an office job in a big company.

2. You know how to apply for a job in a factory.

3. You know how to choose the right school program to help you in your career.

4. You know how to apply to a college for admission.

5. You know how to find out about different kinds of jobs.

6. You know how to arrange a bus or train trip to go out of town.

7. You know how to balance a checkbook.

JTPASCAL (JTPA SCALE) (ALPHA = .9802)
PJTPASCAL

G1 - SOCIAL CLASS, OCCUPATION, AND EDUCATION (ALPHA = .8859)

1. How far did your mother (guardian) go in school?

2. How far did your father (guardian) go in school?

B2 - PARENT SATISFACTION WITH SCHOOL BEHAVIORS (ALPHA = .7835)

1. My parents appreciate it when I try hard, even if I don't succeed all the time.

2. My parents want me to take things seriously.

3. My parents want me to listen to my teacher.

4. My parents want me to try to be successful.

5. My parents want me to think about schoolwork.

B4 - PARENT SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION (ALPHA = .5619)

1. If you fail at something, how do your parents (guardians) usually respond?

2. My parent(s) keep close track of how well I am doing in school.

3. My father (or guardian) helps me with my homework.

4. My mother (or guardian) helps me with my homework.

B7 - PARENT PRESSURE FOR SCHOOL CONTINUATION (ALPHA = .8827)

1. My parents would be disappointed if I dropped out of school.

2. Do your parents want you to go to college someday?

B8 - PARENTAL TOLERANCE OF SCHOOL DEVIANCE (ALPHA = .8066)

1. To your parents, how wrong is cutting class?

2. To your parents, how wrong is dropping out of school?

3. To your parents, how wrong is it for you not doing your homework?

4. How wrong do your parents think it is for you to goof off at school?

5. I would be punished at home if my parents or guardians knew I broke a school rule.

6. My parents (or guardians) would be disappointed if I did not attend school regularly.

B10 - INDEPENDENCE FROM PARENTS (ALPHA = .5688)

1. I am going to need my parents' or guardians' help for some time to come.

2. All in all, I am pretty much able to take care of myself without help from my parents.

3. If I wanted to, I could make enough money to get along on my own.

B11 - ATTACHMENT TO PARENTS (ALPHA = .7912)

1. I have lots of respect for my parents or guardians.

2. How much do you want to be like the kind of person your Mom is?

3. How much do you want to be like the kind of person your Dad is?

4. How close do you feel to your mother or guardian?

5. How close do you feel to your father or guardian?

B19 - LABELING BY PARENTS (ALPHA = .7733)

1. How do you think your mother (guardian) sees you, as a troublemaker?

2. How do you think your mother (guardian) sees you, as a good student?

3. How do you think your mother (guardian) sees you, as needing help with school work?

4. How do you think your father (guardian) sees you, as a troublemaker?

5. How do you think your father (guardian) sees you, as a good student?

6. How do you think your father (guardian) sees you, as needing help with school work?

G22 - GANGS IN SCHOOL (ALPHA = .6591)

1. Did anyone steal something worth less than $1 from your desk, locker, or other place at school?

2. Did anyone steal something worth more than $1 from your desk, locker, or other place at school?

3. Did anyone physically attack or hurt you?

4. Did anyone force you to hand over money or things worth $1 or more directly from you by force, weapons or threats?

5. Did anyone threaten you with a knife or gun?

6. During the last semester and also this semester in school, have you ever had to fight to protect yourself?

7. Are there gang members at your school?

8. Do gangs cause a lot of trouble in your school?

B58 - EXPOSURE TO DROPOUT (ALPHA = .4580)

1. How many of your friends quit school?

2. How far did your mother (guardian) go in school?

3. How far did your father (guardian) go in school?

4. How many of your brothers or sisters graduated from high school?

5. How many of your brothers or sisters dropped out before graduation?

6. Are any of your brothers or sisters still in school?

7. If you have a best friend, is he or she still in school?

B23 - ENJOYMENT OF SCHOOL (ALPHA = .6632)

1. When I'm late for class I feel very anxious.
2. Do you enjoy studying?
3. This school makes me like to learn.
4. Is there some class that you really enjoy going to each day?
5. How do you feel about this school, like or don't like?
6. How do you feel about the classes you are taking, like or don't like?
7. How well do you like to read?

B29 - SCHOOL EFFORT (ALPHA = .6484)

1. Compared to other students, how hard do you work (study) in school?
2. I turn my homework in on time.
3. My school work is messy.
4. I don't bother with homework or class assignments.
5. If a teacher gives a lot of homework, I try to finish all of it.
6. How much time, on the average, do you spend doing homework outside school?

B42 - SCHOOL NON-ATTENDANCE (ALPHA = .7807)

1. In the last four weeks, how many days did you cut school all day?
2. In the last four weeks, how often di you cut one or more of your classes?
3. I have skipped school without a legitimate excuse.
4. Do you come to class late?
5. Do you come to school late?

B36 - REBELLIOUS BEHAVIOR IN SCHOOL (ALPHA = .6617)

1. Do you answer back if a teacher gets angry with you?
2. Do you argue with your teachers?

3. Do you do things that you know will make the teacher angry?

4. Are you quiet in class?

5. Are you disruptive in class?

6. Do you "goof off" in class so that other students can't work?

7. Do you shout out answers before you are asked?

8. Do you get into fights or arguments with other students?

B60 - NEGATIVE PEER INFLUENCE (ALPHA = .6943)

1. How many of your friends have been picked up by, or have been in trouble with the police?

2. Your best friend belongs to a gang, true or false?

3. Your best friend gets in trouble with the police, true or false?

4. Most of my friends smoke cigarettes, true or false?

5. My friends discourage me from smoking cigarettes, true or false?

G18 - SCHOOL REWARDS (ALPHA = .6989)

1. Teachers say nice things about my class work.

2. In the last month, did you get to do something special as a reward?

3. In the last month, did you win an award or prize because of your work in school?

4. In the last month, did you help win an award or a prize for your group or class because of your work in school?

G19 - VICTIMIZATION AT SCHOOL (ALPHA = .7769)

1. Did anyone steal something worth less than $1 from your desk, locker, or other place at school?

2. Did anyone steal something worth $1 or more from your desk, locker or other place at school?

3. Did anyone physically attack or hurt you?

4. Did anyone force you to hand over money or things worth $1 or more directly from you by force, weapons or threat?

5. Did anyone threaten you with a knife or gun?

6. During the last semester and also this semester in school, have you ever had to fight to protect yourself?

G21 - COMMUNITY CRIME **(ALPHA = .6038)**

1. Are there any gangs in the neighborhood where you live?

2. Do gang members try to get you to join their gangs?

G23 - SAFETY IN SCHOOL **(ALPHA = .6990)**

1. During the last semester and also this semester in school, have you ever had to fight to protect yourself?

2. During the last semester and also this semester in school, have you ever seen a teacher threatened by a student?

3. During the last semester and also this semester in school, have you ever seen a teacher hit or attacked by a student?

4. How often do you feel safe while in your school building?

5. How often are you afraid that someone will hurt you or bother you at school?

6. How often are you afraid that someone will hurt or bother you on the way to and from school?

B1 - DISRUPTION OF EDUCATION **(ALPHA = .6698)**

1. How long have you lived in the house or apartment where you live now?

2. How many times has your family moved in the last 5 years?

3. How many different schools have you gone to?

B21 - LABELING BY TEACHER **(ALPHA = .6638)**

1. How do you think most of your classroom teacher see you, as a trouble maker?

2. How do you think most of your classroom teachers see you, as a good student?

3. How do you think most of your classroom teachers see you, as needing help with school work?

4. How do you think most of your classroom teachers see you, as very popular?

5. How do you think most of your classroom teachers see you, as being independent?

6. What kind of a learner do your teachers think you are?

7. My teachers think that I am a slow learner.

G28 - FAIRNESS OF RULES (ALPHA = .6583)

1. The school rules are fair.

2. The punishment for breaking school rules is the same no matter who you are.

3. The principal is fair.

G29 - CLARITY OF RULES (ALPHA = .6790)

1. Everyone knows what the school rules are.

2. The principal runs the school with a firm hand.

B51 - INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION (ALPHA = .5892)

1. This school has special classes for slow learners.

2. I have a learning plan that was made just for me.

3. I can work at my own speed in class.

4. Students at my school can choose harder or easier courses, as best fits their needs.

5. When a student has problems, the school works out a plan to help that student.

6. Students are able to proceed at their own rate in most courses.

7. I can determine what I study.

8. I can change my school program if it is not right for me.

9. In school I can make some decisions about what and how I learn.

10. I have enough opportunities to choose subjects that I like.

G26 - STUDENT/TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS (ALPHA = .5741)

1. I talk to some of my teachers about things other than schoolwork.

2. Teachers help me with schoolwork outside of class.

G30 - STUDENT ABILITY TO INFLUENCE (ALPHA = .5061)

1. Students have little to say in how this school is run.
2. Students can get an unfair school rule changed.
3. Teachers sometimes change their lesson plans because of student suggestions.
4. Students are seldom asked to help solve a problem the school is having.

G20 - INVALIDITY (ALPHA = .4473)

1. I have never disliked anyone.
2. It is easy to get along with nasty people.
3. I sometimes get angry.
4. I like to have fun.
5. I read several whole books every day.

Multiple Regression Table-
With and Without Covariate
(empty cells indicate significance at p > .10)

Scale	Without Covariate	With Covariate
Emotional Isolation	TREATMENT (negative correlation) F(1,108) = 5.58, p<.02	F(1,106)=2.127,p<.09
	TRANSITION (negative correlation) F(1,108) = 7.82, p<.006	F(1,106)=2.089, p<.07
	REDY (negative correlation) F(1,108) = 6.854, p<.01	
Normlessness	TREATMENT (positive correlation) F(1,108) = 4.844 p<.03	
	GED (positive correlation) F(1,108) = 6.166, p<.02	
Practical Competence	TREATMENT (negative correlation) F(1,112) = 3.326, p<.07	
	GED (negative correlation) F(1,112) = 6.013, p<.02	
Vocational Competence	TRANSITION (positive correlation) F(1,111) = 4.645, p<.04	
	REDY (positive correlation) F(1,111) = 5.833, p<.02	
Social Isolation	GED (positive correlation) F(1,103) = 5.996, p<.004	F(1,102)=2.719, p<.02
	REDY (negative correlation) F(1,103) = 6.124, p<.02	F(1,102)=2.176, p<.07
Independence	REDY (positive correlation) F(1,114) = 3.441, p<.04	

APPENDIX F-2

DIFFERENCE-SCORES TABLE

Scale	Without Covariate	With Covariate
Self-Esteem	TREATMENT (increase) $F(1,11) = 5.74$, $p<.05$	$F(1,11) = 5.74$, $p<.05$
Normlessness	TREATMENT (decrease) $F(1,12) = 9.75$, $p<.02$	$F(1,12) = 9.75$, $p<.02$
Interpersonal Competency	TREATMENT (increase) $F(1,12) = 7.83$, $p<.03$	$F(1,12) = 6.14$, $p<.04$
	GED (increase) $F(1,8) = 6.07$, $p<.05$	$F(1,8) = 6.07$, $p<.05$
	TRANSITION (increase) $F(1,12) = 3.93$, $p<.08$	$F(1,12) = 3.93$, $p<.08$
	Handicapped by TRANSITION (increase) $t(3) = 5.91$, $p<.0005$	(not measured)
	Non-Handicapped by GED (increase) $t(2) = 4.35$, $p<.0005$	(not measured)
	Non-Handicapped by TRANSITION (increase) $t(1) = 3.5$, $p<.005$	(not measured)
Practical Competence	GED (increase) $F(1,9) = 15.48$, $p<.006$	$F(1,9) = 15.48$, $p<.006$
Vocational Competence	TREATMENT (increase) $F(1,12) = 21.84$, $p<.002$	$F(1,12) = 21.84$, $p<.002$
Independence	TREATMENT (increase) $F(1,13) = 35.42$, $p<.000$	$F(1,13) = 35.42$, $p<.000$

APPENDIX F-3

Group Comparisons Table/ Likelihood of Good Economic Outcome

	Without Covariate	With Covariate
Treatment* vs. Control,	$x^2(1,114) = 9.59$, $p < .009$ (Treatment)	$x^2(1,21) = 5.47$, $p < .02$ (Treatment)
Graduates vs. Non-Graduates	$x^2(1,57) = 9.18$, $p < .003$ (Graduates)	$x^2(1,33) = 4.22$, $p < .04$ (Graduates)
Treatment vs. Control, controlling for graduates	$x^2(1,33) = 9.81$, $p < .003$ (Treatment)	$x^2(1,33) = 4.22$, $p < .04$ (Treatment)
Treatment vs. Control, controlling for graduates and Non-Handicapped	$x^2(1,21) = 13.89$, $p < .0002$ (Treatment)	
Transition vs. Control	$x^2(1,46) = 5.76$, $p < .02$ (Transition)	$x^2(1,21) = 5.47$, $p < .02$ (Transition)
Transition vs. GED	$x^2(1,75) = 10.87$, $p < .001$ (Transition)	$x^2(1,21) = 4.09$, $p < .05$ (Transition)

* Treatment includes GED and Transition instruction

APPENDIX G

DISSEMINATION INFORMATION

The following people or organizations have been made aware of the SEP II study:

Journals/Publications Contacted

American Psychologist

Bilingual Special Education Newsletter

Education Week

Educational Horizons

Journal of Educational Measurement

The Journal of Special Education

Agencies Alerted

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

U.S. Department of Education, Migrant Education Program Office

Various individual school districts in Oregon and Colorado

Professional/Trade Organizations Alerted

Alliance Association for Alternative Degree Programs

American Psychological Association

American Vocational Association

Colorado Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Colorado Association of Boards of Cooperative Services

Colorado Association of School Executives

Colorado Education Association

Colorado Federation of Teachers

Confederation of Oregon School Administrators

Council for Exceptional Children

Council for Learning Disabilities

International Congress of Psychology

International Technology Education Associates

National Association for Children with Learning Disabilities

National Association of School Psychologists

National Community Education Association

National Education Association

National HEP/CAMP Association

National Rural and Small Schools Consortium

Northwest Evaluation Association

Oregon Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Oregon Association of Education Service Districts

Oregon Association of School Executives

Oregon Association of Vocational Manpower

Oregon Community Education Association

Oregon Education Association

Oregon Federation of Teachers

Participants, National Migrant Education Conference, Portland, Oregon, May, 1989

Policy/Advisory/Information Agencies Alerted

Bilingual Education Division
Eastern Oregon State College

Colorado Career Information System

Colorado Department of Education

Colorado Facilitator, National Diffusion Network

Colorado State Advisory Council on Dropouts

Colorado State Board of Education

Division of Educational Policy and Management
Department of Education
University of Oregon

ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted

Governor Neil Goldschmidt, Oregon

Handicapped Minority Research Institute

Joint Education Committee, Colorado General Assembly

National Association for Bilingual Research

National Center for Bilingual Research

National Center for Educational Statistics

National Dropout Prevention Center

Oregon Career Information System

Oregon Commission for the Handicapped

Oregon Community Education Development Center

Oregon Department of Education

Oregon Research Institute

Oregon State Advisory Council for Career and Vocational Education

Oregon State Board of Education

Oregon Total Information System

Teaching Research Division
Western Oregon State College

University of Colorado, School of Education
Division of Special Education

Western Washington University

Individuals Alerted

Senator Jane Cease, Legislator, State of Oregon

Senator Tony Meeker, Legislator, State of Oregon